

DOCTRINE
OF THE
EUCCHARIST
STATED:
AND THE
HARMONY
BETWEEN THE
PRIMITIVE CHURCH
AND THE
Reformed Church of ENGLAND
MANIFESTED.

By which the CONDUCT of our new ESSENTIALISTS
is Censur'd.

BY
A PRESBYTER of the Church of England.

Printed for T. BICKERTON at the Crown in *Pater-*
Noster-Row. 1720.



48
4 8
945



THE
CONTRACTIONS Unfolded.

Mr. J. Unb. S.	M R. Johnson's <i>Unbloody</i>
Reas.	<i>Sacrifice.</i> <i>Reasons for restoring some</i> <i>Prayers—of the first Eng-</i> <i>lish reform'd Liturgy.</i>
Def. R.	<i>Defence of the Reasons.</i>
Vind. R. D.	<i>Vindication of the Reasons</i> <i>and Defence.</i>
The Necess.	<i>The Necessity of an Alteration.</i>
No Necess.	<i>No necessity to alter the Com-</i> <i>mon-Prayer.</i>
No suf. R.	<i>No sufficient Reason for re-</i> <i>storing the Prayers and Di-</i> <i>rections of K. Edward VI.</i> <i>first Liturgy.</i>
Dr. B. T.	<i>Dr. Brett's Treatise upon Tra-</i> <i>dition.</i>
Dr. B. T. P ^c .	<i>His Postscript to it.</i>
Dr. B. f. Pr.	<i>Dr. Brett's farther Proof.</i>
Dr. B. f. Pr. P.	<i>His Preface to it.</i>
Dr. B. C. L.	<i>Dr. Brett's Collection of Li-</i> <i>turgies.</i>
Dr. B. C. L. P.	<i>His Preface to it.</i>
Dr. B. D.	<i>His Dissertations upon those</i> <i>Liturgies.</i>

Conc.

Conc.

*Mr. Drake's Concio ad Cle-
rum.*

Resp.

*Mr. Wagstaffe's Responsio ad
Concionem.*

Dr. W.

Dr. Whitby.





THE
CONDUCT
OF THE
ESSENTIALISTS
CENSUR'D.



Dear SIR,

I'M very much concern'd and griev'd
for the Disputes and Divisions that
are amongst us; and a great deal
the more, because it hinders some
others from coming over to our
distressed Flock, since we are not agreed among
ourselves. Nay, it makes some to depart from
us, and go over to the Church of *Rome*, or to
some other Schismatical Congregations. The
Argument, indeed, is not good, proves too
much, and wou'd equally affect every Party;
yet the Pretence is too specious; and it is Mat-
ter

ter of Lamentation, that such an unhappy Occasion is given. And altho' Socinians and Free-thinkers always make an ill Use of such Debates as these, yet these Dividers are so far from shewing any Inclination to Peace and Unity, that instead of lessening they multiply the Points in Controversy, they make manifold Alterations, and use but little Temper and Moderation. Instead of restoring King *Edward VI's* Liturgy, so much, at first, contended for, the Essentialists have introduc'd a New, neither Ancient nor Modern, but unprecedented Communion Office. Now, if there was not to be found any one establish'd Liturgy, in any Part of the Church of *Christ*, that could please these Gentlemen, it is very strange that they should imagine that all the World should comply with their new unauthoriz'd Office. I shall begin with the Introits, which, I hope, are not deem'd absolutely necessary, nor very ancient.

I believe, that the leaving out the Ten Commandments will not gratify the sober Part of Mankind.

I am not for restoring the Chrism at Confirmation, nor the Cross in the Lord's Supper.

The curtailing of the Words heretofore used at the delivering of the blessed Sacrament does not please me.

Certainly, if a few Persons, without a general Consent and Approbation, might make what Changes and Improvements they please, there wou'd be Schisms, and Sub divisions without End.

I am certain, some would have a new Review of the Translation of the Bible, some new Canons and Homilies, many would have some few Words alter'd in the 39 Articles, several would have most of the Apocryphal Chapters, now used, left out of the Calendar; and not a few, perhaps, wish, that instead of these Words in the general Confession, *And there is no Health in us*, there were inserted, *And of our selves alone, we cannot save our selves*. Many desire that the damnatory Clauses in *Athanasius's* Creed might be soften'd; and some would have the *Filioque* left out of the *Nicene* Creed; and would be glad, if instead of, *He descended into Hell*, it were said, even in the Apostle's Creed, *He went into Paradise, or Hades*; or, *He continued some time under the Power and Dominion of Death*. But the new Reformers desire, that the most excellent and highest Office in our Church might be more solemn and perfect, the Words more express, and their Sense determin'd. But alas! we are not to depart from an establish'd Communion, for the sake of greater Perfection only, for then there also would be no End of Reforming, since all Forms of humane Composition are imperfect.

Nor cou'd I go over to the dividing Party, not only because it wou'd be Schism, but forasmuch as I cannot descry any End of their reforming Humour, it not being certain that their whole Scheme is as yet fix'd, compleated, and publish'd; and it would be odd and unreasonable in them, to expect that we shou'd adhere to their Communion, 'till we know what we

are to do, and are convinc'd of the Necessity of it.

Nor cou'd I joyn with them, were I otherwise at Liberty, because they make those Things absolutely necessary Parts of divine Worship, which are not so.

And as I was asham'd, when I observ'd in what a scandalous Manner, and with what Scorn and Disdain, some of these learned Gentlemen treat those who oppose them; so it will doubtless give great Offence to many Protestants, when they perceive these zealous Divines so vehemently contending for a new Rule of Practice never yet receiv'd by us.

The Essentialists surprisingly aver, that together with the Scripture, the Tradition of the Church is necessary to instruct us in the essential Parts of our Duty; and that it is the best and surest Rule by which we ought to be directed in our Christian Practice: ^a They say that it is the surest Guide to Truth, and an unerring Rule of Practice; ^b and that the Fathers maintain'd, that in Matters of religious Worship, Tradition alone might make that a necessary Duty, which the Scripture had not made so. ^c They quote St. *Jerome* saying, tho' Scripture Authority cou'd not be pleaded, the Consent of all Christendom wou'd pass for an Equivalent to a Command ^d.

They affirm, that the Rule of Doctrine and Religion, by which all the Priests of the Church of *England* are to be guided — is the holy

^a Dr. B. T. p. 33.

^b The Necess. p. 151.

^c Dr. B. f. Pr.

^d The Necess. p. 159, 166.

Scriptures — as interpreted and understood by the Catholick Fathers, and ancient Bishops, of the first five or six Centuries. That the safest Method which a good Christian can take, is to adhere ---- to that only infallible Rule of true Religion. For the Rule (they say) is certainly Good and infallible^e.

Here then, the proper Question and Point in dispute, is not :

1. Whether Tradition be useful ? or,
2. Whether Scripture interpreted by Tradition is to be depended upon. But,
3. Whether there be any essential Part of the Christian Institution, or any Christian Duty absolutely necessary to Salvation, promulg'd by Christ and his Apostles, and convey'd down to us by Tradition only ?

And I declare for the Negative. The consentient Testimony of the ancient Fathers, is an excellent Means of understanding the sacred Oracles : But their Opinions and Expressions are often to be corrected by that infallible Rule, the Word of God.

A good Life also, is an excellent Means of understanding divine Truths ; for, says our Saviour, *If any Man will do his Will, he shall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself^f.* So is earnest Praying to God that he wou'd open our Understanding, that we may understand his Word ; for, says the Apostle, *If any of you lack Wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all*

^e Dr. B. T. p. 5. 10. ^f St. John 7. 17.

Men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him^g: Yea, so are Grammars, Dictionaries, Lexicons, Glossaries, Commentators, and even the ancient Works of Jews, Infidels, and Hereticks, that were compos'd near the Times of the writing of any Part of the Holy Bible. Especially, the comparing one Text of Scripture with another; for, as Sir *H. Lynde* observes from St. *Augustine*: "The Meaning of the Word, is learn'd out of the Word, and the obscure Places are expounded by the manifest." And he quotes both *Latin* and *Greek* Fathers in Confirmation of this Opinion^h. But now we have two infallible Rules; and this of Tradition is a pretty large one. And here what will become of Thousands that never heard of it, and are never likely to know any thing of it? Vast Parts, great Learning, and Leisure, a sound Judgment, a prodigious deal of Patience and Labour, and the reading of very many, very large Volumes, are necessary for the comprehending of this Rule. Some will say, the ancient Writers of the first five or six Centuries; this is speaking with some Latitude. But others, it may be, will say, of the first eight or nine Centuries; and some only of the three first Ages precisely: Which seems to imply, that this is not a determin'd Rule; and, indeed, that it cannot be fix'd. How then should it be infallible! And if it be such a plain and certain Rule, I wou'd gladly know how it came to pass, that some learned Men

^g St. James i. 5. ^h Vid. Devia. 47, 54.

amongst us were so long in finding it out ; and so unstable when they had found it out ? No sooner had these Gentlemen made Tradition their infallible Rule, but they mistook modern Practices for Apostolical Injunctions, and were deceiv'd and misled into dangerous Errors, and a fatal Schism ; and this does not recommend this Rule to me. And I would advise these learned Divines, to translate all the ancient Fathers, before they again recommend this Rule to all the World ; for if we have justly blam'd the Papists for locking up one infallible Rule in an unknown Tongue, then, if they do so by the other Rule, the like odious Imputation may fall upon them, and their own Arguments be retorted upon them.

And since those of ordinary Capacities cannot easily distinguish the essential, from the less necessary Points, which are convey'd down to us by Tradition only, it would be of singular Use, to have all those collected together, which are really essential to Christianity, and absolutely necessary to Salvation. I presume that it might be done in a little Room.

For myself, I declare, that I do not know of any one essential Point in the whole Compass of Christianity, that is taught us by Tradition alone.

If Tradition be a Rule to Protestants, it is such a one as Mortals never heard of since the Creation, for it is of no use to us as a Rule, it does not teach us any one Article of Faith, nor any one necessary Duty ; a strange Rule, that teacheth us nothing. Papists, indeed, have need

of it, and Reason to contend for it, but Protestants do not want it, they have no Occasion for it. Nay, altho' these Divines have so much contended for Tradition, upon the Occasion of this Controversy, yet they argue for the main Points in dispute from Scripture, and do not depend upon their infallible Rule, for the Proof of any one of them; it may be they are conscious that no fundamental Part of Religion can be establish'd upon Tradition.

And it's remarkable how dubious their Expressions are, and how cautious they are of declaring their express Opinion about this Matter. In the Title of Dr. *B. T.* it is said, Tradition is necessary to explain and interpret the Holy Scriptures; but then, in the 20th §. of that Book, the Doctor declares: " But forasmuch
 " as the Scriptures of the *New Testament* do
 " testify that the Christian Religion was at first
 " deliver'd by Tradition, and that we are as
 " much oblig'd to observe what we find to have
 " been so deliver'd, as what we find to have
 " been written by the Apostles; and these
 " Scriptures do no where teach, that all things
 " taught by our Saviour or his Apostles *as necessary to Salvation*, are there collected and
 " recorded, it evidently follows, that where we
 " have certain and undoubted Testimony of any
 " Thing's being deliver'd by the Apostles as necessary to be practis'd, we are as much
 " obliged to practise accordingly, as if we were
 " requir'd to do so by any Text of Scripture."

In Dr. *B. D.* we are told: * “ That Anti-
 “ quity, Universality, and Consent, join’d with
 “ the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, are
 “ the best Evidence of all Christian Truths.”
 But in the Preface to that Piece, Scripture and
 Tradition are separated, and Tradition is there
 earnestly contended for; and the Vindicator
 says: ¹ “ The Scriptures plainly recommend
 “ Tradition, and enjoin our abiding by it. The
 “ ancient Fathers ——ground general Tradition
 “ upon Apostolical Authority, and vouch it a
 “ safe Rule.”

This seems to argue, that they have some la-
 tent Reason why they do not speak out plainly
 and distinctly.

Methinks, if Tradition be an unerring Rule,
 it is as necessary to have a Canon of all those
 ancient Fathers, and primitive Writers, who de-
 liver this Tradition, as of the sacred Scriptures;
 but since there is no such Canon, and forasmuch
 as there are none amongst us that have Authority
 enough to settle such a one, I conclude, that
 Tradition is no such Rule; and that none can
 now prove from Tradition alone, that such and
 such a thing is essential to Christianity.

When the Corruption of Mankind was very
 great, in the Antediluvian World, then most
 ancient Custom, general and unanimous Practice,
 were but deceitful Guides. After the Deluge,
 Oral Tradition did not long preserve the true
 Religion. The Tradition which the *Jews* had,
 that the *Messiah* shou’d be a temporal Prince,

did prove pernicious to them. The Heathens, in the primitive Times, were fixt in their Superstition and Idolatry, by Tradition and Prescription, says *Lactantius*^m: If you require of them the Reason of their Persuasion, they can make no other Answer, but that they fly to the Judgment of their Ancestors, that they were wise Men, did prove and know what was best: And the Papists, by making Tradition a Rule, have dreadfully corrupted the Roman Church.

This shou'd make us have a jealous Eye upon mere Tradition; and to take Care that we do not place that Faith in Man, which is due only to the ever living God.

Certainly, Tradition may easily be corrupted, a great and admir'd Person may be deceitful, and altho' sincere, yet he may be mistaken, and by his Authority and Reputation, mislead his Admirers; and a small Deviation may soon prove to be of ill Consequence. The Turn that may be given to a receiv'd Notion, by the Notes and Commentaries of those that transmit it down at second hand, may utterly deface an ancient Tradition. I think therefore, that he who wou'd build upon a sure Foundation, shou'd make the infallible Word of God his only Rule, for all the essential and absolutely necessary Parts of Christianity.

The Use of Tradition (besides the attesting the Books of sacred Scripture) is to shew the unreasonableness of imposing any Sense upon the holy Scripture, against the universal Sense of

^m L. 5. §. 19. p. 517.

the Church of Christ, in the purest Ages; but it is not that into which our Faith is to be resolved; nor is it to over-rule our Practice in Matters of the greatest Importance, for our good God has infinitely better provided for us, by giving us his holy Word to guide us, rather than to leave us to the uncertainty of Tradition: And the Holy Bible being a divine Revelation, I therefore believe that it does contain all things absolutely necessary. I believe that our heavenly Father did so reveal his Will, that the inspir'd Scriptures might be a perfect Rule in all Cases of the greatest Importance; and that they shou'd not be defective in any essential Part of our Religion. Fallible Tradition may confirm our Interpretation of the sacred Oracles, but cannot make any Point necessary that has not a good Foundation in Scripture; for if Tradition alone did teach us some absolutely necessary Truths, then, methinks, the holy Scriptures wou'd be imperfect in a high Degree.

The great *Jehovah* says, *Deut. 4. 2. Ye shall not add unto the Word, which I command you, neither shall you diminish ought from it.* And *Isaiah* says, *c. 8. v. 20. To the Law, and to the Testimony; if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no Light in them.* Our blessed Saviour does not remit the *Jews* to Tradition, but commands them to search the Scripture, *St. John 5. 39.* And *St. Paul* does assure us, that *all Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness; that the Man of God*

may be perfect, thoroughly furnish'd unto all good Works. 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. And that it is able to make one wise unto Salvation, through Faith which is in Christ Jesus, *ŷ*. 15. These Texts, I presume, do prove that the Old Testament is a divine Revelation, and as such does contain all the essential and necessary Parts of the Jewish Religion. Here then, I think one may equally conclude, that forasmuch as the New Testament was written by divine Inspiration, and is the last and most perfect Revelation of the Will of God, publish'd on purpose to direct Christians in the Way to everlasting Salvation; therefore it contains all the absolutely necessary and essential Parts of our holy Religion; for as Dr. *W.* argues: " " If the Scriptures of the Old Testament were sufficient " to make a Man wise unto Salvation, through " Faith which is in *Christ Jesus*; ° the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament must " much more be so, because the Scriptures of " the New Testament must needs more plainly " and fully contain the Faith and Duty of all " Christians, than the Scriptures of the Old " only can be suppos'd to do."

But in contradiction to this, the Essentialists undertake to prove from Scripture, that Tradition is a Part of the Rule which Christians are to walk by. ^p St. *Paul*, say they, commands the *Corinthians*, to keep the Ordinances as he delivered them unto them. 1 Cor. 11. 2. and he gives this Exhortation to the *Thessalonians*,

ⁿ 2 Tim. 3. 14. &c. ° *ŷ*. 15. ^p Dr. B. C. L. P. p. 15, &c.

Therefore, Brethren, stand fast, and hold the Traditions you have been taught, whether by Word, or by our Epistle, 2 Thess. 2. 15. And his Injunction to Timothy, is, The things that thou hast heard of me, among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also, 2 Tim. 2. 11.

To these Texts of Scripture, I answer:

1. Apostolical Traditions are to be observ'd; give us then a Catalogue of necessary, extra-scriptural Duties, and prove them to be really Apostolical, and you have gain'd your Point. Therefore, I say:

2. Several Parts of the New Testament were written after these Epistles, and these Texts do not prove, that there are any fundamental Articles of Faith, or essential Duties of Christianity, which are not deliver'd more or less plainly and expressly, in some other Books of the New Testament, written either before or after these Epistles; yet this is the Point in dispute. Wherefore I add:

3. We cannot be oblig'd by these Texts, to practise any Duty as absolutely necessary to Salvation, which we cannot know to be so; and there is no essential Part of our holy Religion transmitted down to us by Tradition only. There is no constant universal Tradition, in the Christian Church, from the Apostolical Times, that there are Duties necessary to Salvation, not contain'd in the Holy Scripture; and therefore you cannot, from these Passages, prove our Obligation to practise any extra-scriptural Duty.

It

It was not long after the *Nicene* Council, before Traditions Apostolical were so miserably corrupted, that they are not to be rely'd upon. And therefore, altho' *Epiphanius* cou'd say, in the 4th Century, ^a that the Apostolical Constitutions, contain'd the whole Canonical Order (*i. e.* the Order of divine Worship) and nothing adulterated, which concerns either Faith, or the true Profession; yet these Constitutions have been condemn'd above 1000 Years ago, in the Council in *Trullo*, in these Words (says Mr. *Johnson* :) " Because in these Constitutions
 " many spurious things, inconsistent with Piety,
 " have been inserted, by heterodox Men of
 " old, to the Destruction of the Church, which
 " have obscur'd the decorous Comeliness of the
 " divine Institutions-----judging it by no means
 " agreeable, to annex the Bratts of heretical
 " Fiction to the genuine and sincere Doctrine
 " of the Apostles."

4. Before the New Testament was written, Tradition then was the Christian's Rule. When Part only was written, then the holy Scripture and oral Tradition were the Believer's Rule. But when all the Books of the New Testament were written, then nothing in practice was to be urg'd as a Duty necessarily incumbent on Christians, but what had a good Foundation in the Word of God.

Origen, or the Author of the Dialogue against the *Marcionites* ^s says, " If the Apostles had
 " not left in writing what they preach'd, they

^a *Dr. B. T. p.* 127. ^r *Vade Mecum, p.* 265, 266. ^s *Page* 59.

“ had preach’d Salvation only to them who
 “ heard them preach, but had exhibited no
 “ Knowledge thereof to Posterity ; for those
 “ things which are deliver’d, but not in wri-
 “ ting, do quickly vanish, seeing that they
 “ have no Demonstration of their Truth.”

And St. *Cyril* ^t therefore warns us, not to believe what they (the ancient Fathers) say, unless we find it demonstrated out of the Holy Scriptures.

5. The Holy Scriptures being a compleat Rule of Faith and Manners, therefore nothing absolutely necessary to Salvation is left to be taught us by Tradition alone. And the learned Author of the *No Suff. R.* has fully prov’d, by Apostolical Tradition, “ that the Word of God does contain in it all things that are of absolute Necessity, to be believ’d or practis’d by us ”. St. *Irenæus* (as he observes) speaking of the Gospel, teaches ; “ That the Apostles deliver’d it to us in the
 “ Scriptures, to be the Foundation and Pillar
 “ of our Faith. And he complains, ^x that
 “ when the Hereticks, he writ against, were
 “ confuted out of Scripture, they set them-
 “ selves to accuse the Scriptures, as if we had
 “ them not right, or as if they wanted Authority,
 “ or as differently express’d, and because Truth
 “ cannot be found out by their Help, except
 “ by such as are acquainted with Tradition.”
^y *Tertullian* adores the Fullness of Scripture ; and challenges *Herm.* and his Followers, “ To
 “ beware of the dreadful Woe denounc’d against

^t Cyr. Hieros. Catech. 4. p. 3. ^u Part 1. p. 6. &c. ^w L. 3. c. 1.
^x L. 3. c. 2. ^y Adver. Herm. c. 22.

“ those who add to, or detract from the Word
 “ of God.” *St. Clemens Alexandrinus* : ^z “ We
 “ use the Scriptures as the *Criterion*, to find out
 “ Things----- We do not wait for the Testi-
 “ mony of Men, but prove that which is
 “ sought after by the Voice of the Lord, which
 “ is more satisfactory than all Demonstration;
 “ or rather, is the only Demonstration.” Says
Origen, ^a “ If any thing remains undetermin’d
 “ by these divine Writings, no other third
 “ Scripture may be receiv’d for our Instruction.”
 - *St. Cyprian*, ^b “ If it be commanded in the
 “ Gospel, or be contain’d in the Epistles, or
 “ Acts of the Apostles-----let this divine and
 “ holy Tradition be observ’d. But if the con-
 “ trary be true, how is it that they may not
 “ seem fit to be condemn’d by us, who appear
 “ by the Testimony of the Apostle to be con-
 “ demn’d by themselves?” *St. Athanasius* ^c
 tells *Marcellinus*, “ That the Scripture is the
 “ Mistress of Virtue and true Faith; and says,
 “ ^d the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are
 “ sufficient for the Declaration of the Truth;
 “ that ^e they are the Wells of Salvation, in
 “ these only is the Doctrine of Godliness de-
 “ clar’d. Let no Man add any thing to these,
 “ nor take any thing from them.” *St. Basil*
 declares, ^f “ If I speak of myself, hear me not,
 “ if I rehearse the Things that are written, yield
 “ to the Truth; and ^g all Scripture is divinely
 “ inspired and profitable, being written by the

^z Strom. L. 7. p. 890. Ed. Oxon. ^a Hom. 5. p. 66. ^b Ep. 74.
^c Ep. ad Marc. ^d Orat. c. Gent. p. 1. ^e Fragment Ep. 39. ^f Hom.
 29 Adv. Calum. Trinit. ^g Hom in Psalm. 1.

“ Spirit on purpose, that here, as in a common
 “ Hospital for Souls, every one may collect a
 “ Medicine for his own Passions, &c. and ^h all
 “ that is besides the divinely inspired Scriptures,
 “ being not of Faith, is Sin.” St. *Ambrose*
 teaches, ⁱ “ That we must neither detract any
 “ thing from the divine Commandments, nor
 “ add to them.” *Vincent. Lirin’s* Rules for
 finding out what is Orthodox, are, ^k “ First, by
 “ the Authority of the divine Law, and then
 “ by the Tradition of the Catholick Church.
 “ We have no such Power, says *Greg. Nyssen*,
 “ ^l I mean, of saying whatever we please, since
 “ we have used the Rule and Law of all
 “ Doctrine, the holy Scripture.” St. *Chry-*
sofome prays and beseeches his Auditors, ^m
 “ That not minding what pleases this or that
 “ Man, they wou’d enquire of all things from
 “ the Scriptures.” St. *Cyril of Alexandria*,
 puts this Question, ⁿ “ What the divine Scrip-
 “ ture has not said, how shall we receive, and
 “ reckon it among the things that are true?”
 Says *Theodore*t, ^o “ Our Business is not to seek
 “ after the things that have been kept in si-
 “ lence, but to stick to those that are written.”
 Against these Testimonies, Dr. *Brett* produces
 several of the Fathers speaking in behalf of
 Tradition; and altho’ one wou’d think that it
 were no great Crime for a Divine to argue for
 the Perfection of the Oracles of God, yet he
 takes offence, and crys out, ^p “ That it is very

^h In Mor. Reg. 80. ⁱ De Parad. c. 12. ^k Common. 2. c. 1.
^l De Anima & Resur. p. 200. ^m Hom. 13. in 2. Cor. ⁿ In Gen.
 L. 2. ^o In Gen. Q. 45. ^p Dr. B. f. P. p. 64.

“indifferent to his Opponent, whether the Fa-
 “thers are to be reconcil’d or not, whether
 “they speak agreeably to themselves or one
 “another.”

St. *Basil*, I think, is not consistent with him-
 self, and clashes also with the other Fathers, I
 shall therefore leave him to be reconcil’d to
 them, and to himself, by Dr. *Brett*, and his
 Distinction: ^q Nay, since the Doctor sets aside
 the learned and pious Martyr St. *Cyprian*, for
 opposing Tradition too much, ^r I think, I may
 justly discard the great St. *Basil* for advancing
 it too high; especially, since he has declar’d,
 “That the Testimony of two Fathers are of
 “no Weight at all, when they assert any
 “thing contrary to the Doctrine of the whole
 “Church.” The rest of these Fathers I shall
 undertake to reconcile to themselves, and to
 one another, and in favour of our own Opi-
 nion: And this I shall do in the following Re-
 marks upon what Dr. *Brett* says against the
 Testimonies before produc’d, for the Perfection
 of the sacred Scriptures.

As to *Irenæus*, Dr. *Brett* says, ^t that he
 urges against Heretick’s Tradition, not only
 in Matters of less moment, but also in Funda-
 mentals of Religion, and Points of the greatest
 Importance; which seems to clash with what he
 says to reconcile St. *Basil* ^u.

Answer, Yes, against those Hereticks who re-
 jected the Scripture, ^w and he was in the right,
 and yet you may be in the wrong, if you pre-

^q *Ibid.* p. 65. ^r Dr. B. T. Pt. p. 158. ^s Dr. B. D. p. 182. ^t Dr.
 B. f. Pt. p. 60, 61. ^u *Ibid.* p. 65 ^w V. Iren. L. 3. c. 2.

tend to prove, that in Practice, such and such a thing is an absolutely necessary Duty, which you have no Scripture for; this did not *Irenæus*.

Tertullian, you say, * was certainly no Enemy to Tradition.

A. Nor is there any Reason he shou'd be so; nor does this make him clash with himself, or oppose the most ancient Fathers.

From *Clem. Alexand.* you say, † there is nothing produc'd that seems to bear hard upon Tradition.

A. Therefore he does not need to be reconcil'd to himself, or to any other ancient Writer.

You add, ‡ *Origen* is a Friend to Tradition.

A. So were all the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and yet they made the sacred Scriptures only, the infallible Rule both of Faith and Practice; and you might have been a Friend to it, without any Opposition, if that wou'd have satisfy'd you.

St. Cyprian § opposed a Tradition which he conceiv'd was against Scripture; and so far he does not want to be justified; and if *St. Cyprian*, that renowned Martyr, opposed it too much, *Stephen* press'd it too far. Says *Mr. Reeves*,^b *St. Cyprian*, and *Pope Stephen*, "Were both in the Extreme, and both equally condemn'd by the primitive Church." Now if those famous Bishops were mistaken in the Matter of Tradition in the third Century, we shou'd have a Care that we be not misled by it in the eighteenth. The farther we are re-

* *Dr. B. T. Pt. p. 154.* † *Ibid. p. 155.* ‡ *Ibid. p. 157.* § *Ibid. p. 158.* ^b Notes on *Vin. Lir. Com. c. 11.*

moved from the Apostolical Age, the less certainly can we argue from Tradition only; and, perhaps, the Customs of Apostolical Churches only, were sometimes call'd, by the ancient Fathers, Apostolical Traditions. The Rules given by *Vin. Lirin.* and *St. August.*^c do not imply, that any essential and necessary Duty, which we ought to practise, is convey'd down to us by Tradition only, which is all that I here contend for. *St. Athanasius, Vincentius Lirin, and Gregory Nyssen,* joyn Scripture and Tradition together, and so neither contradict themselves, nor oppose one another.

St. Ambrose needs no Apology: And says *Doctor Brett*,^d " I do not find that any of the
" Passages cited from *St. Chrysostome, Cyril,*
" and *Theod.* do tend to depreciate Tradition;
therefore these need no Reconciliation.

And now, I hope, one may say with *St. Augustine*:^e " Amongst the things that are openly laid down in Scripture, all those are to be
" found that contain the Faith, or Manners of
" living."

Dr. Brett says,^f " There is enough in Scripture to satisfy us, that the Points just before
" mention'd there are lawful; but it is from
" Tradition that we are convinc'd of their
" Necessity."

A. I think that this is no just Observation, but derogating from the inspir'd Scripture.

The Necessity of some of those things may be prov'd from Scripture independent on Tradition

^c *Dr. B. S. Pt. p. 163.* ^d *Ibid. p. 163.* ^e *B. Aug. de Doct. Christ. L. 2. c. 9.* ^f *Dr. B. D. p. 410.*

tion. The Necessity of them arises not from the Tradition of Men, but the written Revelation of God. Our Duty becomes necessary, as soon as it is discover'd in the Oracles of God: If then we can produce the consentient Testimony of the earliest Fathers, confirming our Interpretation of the holy Scriptures, that will farther convince us that we are right in our Judgment; and then we can declare our Opinion with the greater Satisfaction and Assurance, because supported by so great Authority: But still it is the Revelation of the Duty, in the divine written Law, that makes it necessary.

The best Rules then, for discovering when an important Point in Religion is an Apostolical Institution and Tradition, are (I think) these two:

First, ^s To consider whether the Point under Consideration has a real Foundation in the Gospel, tho', it may be, not so fully, and clearly, and expressly deliver'd there, as some other weighty Matters are: For, as the learned Author of *No Suff. R.* observes, ^h St. Cyprian says, " ⁱ God witnesses, that those things are to be done which are written." And St. Augustine says, " ^k If any one, I will not say, if we, who are in no wise to be compar'd to him, who said, *Though we*; but as he added in the following Words; *Though an Angel from Heaven shou'd preach to you, either concerning Christ, or his Church, or any other thing belonging to our Faith or Life, besides what*

^s Vide 39. Art. 6. ^h Pt. 1. p. 10. 17. ⁱ Ep. 74. ^k Cont. Petil. L. 3. c. 6.

“ ye have receiv’d in the legal and evangelical
 “ Scriptures, let him be Anathema.” And
 then :

Secondly, ¹ To observe whether our Interpretation of those Texts of Scripture, upon which our Opinion is grounded, may, according to *Vicentius, Lirinensis’s* Rule, be supported by Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, as being a Truth that has been receiv’d, *semper, ubique, & ab omnibus*, in all Times, at all Places, and by all the Faithful. According to *St. Augustin’s* golden Rule, which is: ^m “ Whatsoever
 “ the universal Church holdeth, and which was
 “ not instituted by any Council, but has been
 “ always observ’d, that we most rightly conclude to have been deriv’d from Apostolical
 “ Authority.”

Here then I undertake to shew, that the Essentialists can never vindicate their late Conduct, upon the Account of the four Points so much controverted of late.

The Breach of Unity in the Church, is a Crime of so deep a Die, and so dreadful a Consequence, that unless they have greater Reasons, for what they have done, than do yet appear, they cannot justify their Departure from their Brethren.

In general, they are highly blameable, and utterly defenceless, in that they might have expected to be conniv’d at in the Practice of the most important of those things which they do

¹ The Rule given to the Clergy in Convocation, 1571. in *Dr. B. T. p. 1, 2.* ^m *Dr. B. T. p. 40.* ⁿ *Aug. de Bap. Cont. Don. c. 24.*

so vehemently contend for: For which unanswerable Reason, they can neither clear themselves, nor those that adhere to 'em.

To come to Particulars. The first thing which I shall speak to, is, praying for the Dead.

And I am utterly against the use of the Prayer which they newly restor'd; for how useful the Practice of it might be in former Ages, yet I wou'd not have it introduc'd, not only because it may give great Offence; but especially, because in this Libertine Age, those that are already too loose, may be apt to take still greater Liberty, when once they have entertain'd a Notion, that after Death they may be reliev'd, by the devout Prayers of those who shall survive them.

And the Testimonies, which these learned Divines alledge wou'd have had more Weight with me, had their Authors been more unanimously agreed about the Matter and Form of these Prayers, or whether they shou'd be made for Deliverance from Pain, or Improvement of Comfort; or whether they shou'd be offer'd up to God for all, even Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, to whom it was supposed no increase of Felicity cou'd thereby be added until the Resurrection; or only for the Generality of Christians: But I absolutely reject the new Prayer, by reason it wants Antiquity, the Practice whereof is neither Scriptural, nor truly Apostolical. The Arguments brought for it, have not Strength enough to demonstrate it to be absolutely necessary to restore the same in the Communion Office.

Mr. *Deacon*, indeed, with youthful Confidence, says, ° that they plead for the offering up to God the tremendous Sacrifice of the Eucharist, for the departed Faithful, as well as for the Living.

A. I presume that this Gentleman wou'd have a pretty hard Task, were he bound to prove from Scripture this Assertion in the Terms he has deliver'd it: For my part, I do not think that praying for the Dead, Good or Bad, is an essential Part of Christian Worship, or necessary to Salvation, which is never mention'd in the Word of God; which was not heard of (that I know of) in the ancient Church of God, 'till in the late corrupted State of the *Jews*, and the Practice of it related only in the *Maccabees*, and then with such Circumstances that cannot be justified; and that was never taken notice of (that I hear of) in the Christian Church, 'till recommended by a *Montanist* at the End of the second Century.

There has been more said about praying for the Dead in general, than has been necessary, the Point in dispute being only, whether it be necessary or no to pray for the Dead, at the holy Altar, as often as we celebrate the blessed Communion; and the Essentialists pretend to have demonstrated, “ That it is an essential
“ Duty, absolutely necessary at the ministrati-
“ on of the Eucharist^p.” And yet there is nothing of this injoin'd in the New Testament. And *Tertullian* says, ^q that praying for the

° Page 139. ^p Dr. B. D. p. 398. ^q De Coron. Mil. p. 102.
Ed. Par.

Dead is not a Duty commanded in the sacred Scripture.

But the Vindicator, not willing to rely upon Tradition only, even at the same time that he says Tradition is to govern our Practice no less than what is written, does argue, that *Tertullian* might only mean, that there was no Law in Scripture for making the Oblations for the Dead on the Anniversary of their Decease, “ That he might restrain the no written Rule to the Circumstances, not to the Substance; for in this Place mention is made of Baptism and of the holy Eucharist, where it is plain, the no Law in Scripture falls upon the Ceremony, not upon the Sacraments.”

A. No one can think, that *Tertullian* restrains the no written Law to Baptism, for he does not there absolutely mention it; nor to the holy Eucharist, for (which obviates all Objections of that Nature) he there declares, that we have a Command for it in Scripture. But the no Law must fall upon all those Particulars mention'd in that Passage, after the two Sacraments, especially, the Oblations for the Dead, for these are Customs which are not commanded in Scripture.

But the Vindicator adds, that Prayer for the Dead had Custom to confirm it in *Tertullian's* Time, that that Custom reach'd beyond the Memory of Man; therefore the Practice of it then stood upon the Credit which that Generation gave to that which preceded it; that *Ter-*

^r Vin. l. R. D. Pt. 2. p. 9. &c. ^r V. Def. R. p. 63. ^r Vin. l. R. D. p. 15.

tullian gave his Evidence for this Point, betwixt the Years, *A. D.* 207. and 210. Now allowing [which I do not take to be necessary] sixty Years for that Generation, that will carry the Practice as high as the Year 150; and if it was then a Custom, as what *Tertullian* says does suppose [which is not allow'd] then a modest Calculation will carry it on to the Apostle St. *John*.

To this I answer, *First*, That it is much if the necessity of an Article, of such vast Importance, may be determin'd by such a nice Calculation, supported by so many Postulata's.

Secondly, Allowing but about thirty-three Years for a Generation (and so says Bishop *Patrick*, it signifies in Scripture) that will carry it but to the Year 177; and if it did but begin then (and more is not here prov'd) it will follow, that this Practice is unscriptural, is no Apostolical Custom, and is far from being an absolutely necessary Duty.

But this Author avers, " that from the Concessions that praying for the Dead began, *A. D.* 138. he can, with a very little Trouble, dispatch the rest, and prove, that it was the Practice of the Apostolical Age.

A. With very little Trouble, indeed, by only supposing what you can never prove; and saying, "*Began, i. e.* it was practis'd thus early in " the second Century." But from those Concessions you can never prove your Point, unless you can prove that what began to be the Prac-

" On *Judg.* 3. 8. " *Ibid.* p. 105.

tice of some in the Year 138, was an Apostolical Custom; but this is impossible*.

But the Essentialists not being content to rely upon Tradition only, tho' with them an infallible Rule, have attempted, in contradiction to *Tertullian's* Testimony, to prove, that praying for the Dead is a Duty commanded in the New Testament, and practis'd by *St. Paul*.

They say, that *St. Paul* did pray for *Onesiphorus*, *2 Tim. i. 18*.

A. They have not yet prov'd, and I presume that they will never be able to make it out, that *Onesiphorus* was then dead; wherefore this Text is nothing to their Purpose; and, I think, that *St. Paul's* praying for him, is a convincing Proof that he was then alive; to this agree all the Fathers: And it was not an Apostolical Practice to pray expressly for the Dead.

Dr. Brett y would prove praying for the Dead a scriptural Duty commanded, *Eph. 6. 18*. because we are there positively requir'd, to make supplication for all Saints; and he has produc'd twelve Texts, wherein he says the Word *Saints* is applied, in the New Testament, to the Saints departed, viz. *Matt. 27. 52. Luke 1. 70. Acts 3. 21. 1 Cor. 6. 1. Eph. 2. 19. Col. 1. 12. 1 Thess. 3. 13. 2 Thess. 1. 10. 2 Pet. 3. 2 Rev. 11. 18. and 16. 6. and 17. 6.* Now,

I shall refer you to above twenty Texts, and cou'd have mention'd more, where the Word *Saints* manifestly signifies Christians, that were the living Members of the Church militant: As,

* No *Suf. R.* p. 81. y *Dr. B. D.* p. 190, &c.

Acts. c. 9. v. 13, 32. *Rom.* i. 7. and 12. 13. and 15. 25, 26. and 16. 2, 16. *1 Cor.* i. 2. and 14. 33. and 16. 1. *2 Cor.* i. 1. and 9. 12. and 13. 13. *Eph.* i. 1, 15. *Phil.* 4. 21, 22. *1 Tim.* 5. 10. *Heb.* 6. 10. and 13. 25. *St. Jude* v. 3.

Here then the Question is, whether by *Saints*, *Eph.* 6. 18. is meant, the Faithful departed, or living Christians. I shall offer three Reasons, why I conceive, that there is no just Cause to understand that Text of the Dead: And,

First, If a Majority in the Number of Texts alledg'd be of any Weight, then the Cause will go against the Doctor; and, methinks, the Sense of the Word *Saints* in the Text being disputed, it shou'd be understood according to the more general Use and Signification of it, in the New Testament; especially, since there is nothing in the Text, or Context, that does determine the meaning of that Word, as apply'd by Dr. Brett: Nor has he brought the Testimony of the ancient Fathers interpreting that Text as he does. For they unanimously interpret it of the *Saints* on Earth.

Secondly, And I rather think that the Apostle's Intent, by this general Precept, was not to oblige us to pray for those departed; because, when, in the New Testament, particular Directions are given concerning the Persons for whom we are to pray, it is requir'd, that we shou'd pray for all Men, *for Kings, and for all in Authority.* *1 Tim.* 2. 1, 2. *and for one another.* *James* 5. 16. *and even for those that persecute us.* *Matt.* 5. 44. But as for praying for the Dead, that is a Point that is nowhere mention'd

tion'd in the sacred Oracles; and if it were, it wou'd, after all, be nothing to the Purpose; because it wou'd not thence follow, that it was an essential Part of the eucharistical Service, which was the thing that was to be prov'd.

Thirdly, Praying expressly for the Dead was no Apostolical Practice.

St. *Polycarp*, in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, prays that they may have their Lot and Portion amongst the Saints; and that he also may be together with them: Then adds, "And all
" that are under the Heavens, who shall believe
" in our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and in his Father,
" &c." Which Passage seems to exclude the Dead. And, in the Relation of his Martyrdom, we are assur'd, that in his Prayer, which he made when he was in the Custody of the Soldiers, he remember'd all Men, whether little or great, honourable or obscure, who had at any time been acquainted with him, "and
" with them, the whole Catholick Church
" over all the World." Which Expression plainly excludes the Saints departed, and Church triumphant, out of his Prayers. Says *Justin Martyr*:^b "After the Believer is baptiz'd, and
" so incorporated and made one with us, we
" lead him to the Congregation of the Brethren,
" as we call them, and then, with great Fer-
" vency, pour out our Souls in common
" Prayers, both for ourselves, for the Person
" baptiz'd, and for all others all the World
" over, &c." And then Prayers being over,

^a §. 12. ^a §. 8. ^b Apol. 1. §. 85.

they proceeded to the eucharistical Service, as he there declares.

Now the Essentialists say, " That the Direction to *pray for the whole State of Christ's Church militant here on Earth*, are not only Terms of Omission but Exclusion, they are limited to this World, and evidently bar the other. — So that the Dead cannot have the Advantage of being remember'd at the eucharistick Sacrifice."

Hence I argue, that St. *Justin Martyr*, by the Words, *all others all the World over*, does exclude the Dead from their Prayers: But let this pass for nothing, yet it's plain from what I have quoted out of *Justin Martyr*, that their Prayers for others were ended before they began the eucharistical Service, which is what I particularly contend for. Prayers for the Dead were not then an essential and necessary Part of the eucharistical Service; and, I think, that his Authority is decisive. Now, in this most early and unblemish'd^d Age, " When the Church continued an unspotted Virgin, unpolluted with any Corruptions; whilst the Bishops and Pastors had no secular Views, nor sought to please either Prince or People, or to make Religion subservient to any secular Ends; whilst the *Charismata*, or miraculous Graces and Gifts of the holy Spirit, continued in the Church." It can't be thought, if Prayers for the Dead had been an essential and necessary Part of the eucharistical

^c Vind. R. D. 2. p. 85. ^d D. B. D. p. 32. Vind. R. D. Pt. 2. p. 103.

Service, that they wou'd have been excluded by those of the purest and most ancient Church,
 " Who stood upon the highest Ground for the
 " Prospect into Truth, and who serv'd God
 " with the noblest Proof of Sincerity and Resolution, who chose to be *destitute, afflicted, tormented^e*, rather than renounce their Belief."

" But now, *the Vindicator^f* says, if these Prayers be lawful, I will thence prove the Necessity of them."

A. That Argument is good for nothing, that proves too much. From the Lawfulness and Serviceableness of a thing, you can't prove the Necessity; for it is lawful for a Christian to sell his Estate in times of Persecution, to relieve those that are in want, *Acts* 4. 34, 35, 36, 37. but yet this is not necessary, *Acts* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4.

Dr. *Brett* says, ^g we disobey the Scriptures, when we exclude the Departed from our Prayers.

A. Tertullian affirms, that praying for the Dead is no scriptural Duty. And if this be true, then the Doctor teaches for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

But he interprets *Eph.* 6. 18. by the Practice of the Church.

A. The Custom he pleads for, was not built upon that Text, and I have interpreted that Injunction another way, by the Practice of the Apostolical and more pure Ages of the Church.

But Dr. *Brett* affirms, ^h that the Ancients, as appears from all the Liturgies and Testimonies

^e Heb. c. 11. ^f Vind. R. D. Pt. 2. p. 103. ^g Dr. B. D. p. 204. ^h *Ibid.* p. 204.

of the primitive Fathers, produc'd by him, always remember'd the Dead in particular, whenever they celebrated the Eucharist.

A. This Practice, although it was more ancient than the Days of *Tertullian*, yet it was later than the Time in which *St. Justin Martyr* flourish'd.

The Vindicator tells us, ⁱ if the Church of *Smyrna's* Application to the Throne of Grace, "Went so far as to desire a supplemental Happiness to *St. Polycarp*, 'twas a virtual Prayer for him."

A. I should wonder, if, at last, such a virtual Prayer should be all that these Divines contend for. Methinks our Liturgy proves, that we are not wanting in holding such a Communion as this with the Saints departed.

Dr. Brett affirms, ^k "That we are as much requir'd to pray for the Saints departed, as we are to baptize Infants, because we are commanded to baptize all Nations^l; for the Scripture positively requires to make Supplications for all Saints^m. The Words *all Saints*, being as universal as the Words *all Nations*, this Command as necessarily obliges us to pray for all Saints, whether they be in this World, or whether they be departed, as the other does to baptize all Persons of all Ages."

A. The words *all Nations*, do not, in the New Testament, most frequently signify Men and Women, exclusive of Children; and there are several Passages in the Old and New Testament,

ⁱ Vind. R. D. p. 95. ^k *Dr. B. D.* p. 190, 193. ^l Matt. 28. 19. ^m Eph. 6. 18.

that will convince any well dispos'd Person, that Infants are included in the Text, *Matt.* 28. 19. and Infants were admitted under the Law, and before it too, into the Church and Covenant of God, by Circumcision; and our Saviour appointing Baptism to be the Initiatory Sacrament, by which all Christians are to be admitted into the Church of Christ, and the Covenant of Grace; it was therefore natural for the Apostles, who were *Jews*, to conceive that Children were comprehended by the Words *all Nations*.

And the Necessity of Infant Baptism, may be prov'd from Scripture independent on Tradition. See Mr. *Allens* serious and friendly Address to the Nonconformists, &c. and Mr. *Wall's* Defence of his Book of Infant Baptism.

But the Word *Saints* does, in the New Testament, more frequently denote the Living than the Dead; nor is there any one Word, in any other Part of the Holy Scriptures, to incline us to believe that we are commanded to pray for the Dead. *Eph.* 6. 18. nor can this be prov'd a Duty from Scripture without a Tradition.

Here then I positively affirm, that we are not as much requir'd, by the written Word of God, to pray for the Dead, as to baptize Infants.

Dr. *Brett* adds, " We have as early and as plain Testimonies, of the Church, for Prayer for the Dead, as we have for the baptizing Infants."

A. St. Justin Martyr says: " I can produce
 " abundance of both Sexes, who have, from
 " their Childhood, been discipled unto Christ."
 And this I take to be a more early Testimony
 for baptizing of Infants, than can be brought
 for praying for the Saints in another World; for
 the discipling of Christians was by Baptism,
Matt. 28. 19. and our Author uses the same
 Word, as does the inspir'd Writer; and, as Mr.
Reeves farther observes: ° " These Disciples,
 " he says also, continued Virgins all their Time,
 " which is another Argument of their being
 " baptiz'd from their Childhood; but above all,
 " the opposing these Children to such as had
 " chang'd from Intemperance; and, consequent-
 " ly, were Men, and converted and baptiz'd,
 " upon a due Consideration of the Christian
 " Principles. This Opposition, I say, makes it
 " plain to me, that he means such Persons as
 " were discipled into Christ, before they were
 " capable of bearing the Christian Doctrine by
 " Institution." However, since this Prayer can-
 not be prov'd, either from Scripture or Aposto-
 lical Tradition, to be absolutely necessary,
 much less an essential Part of the eucharistical
 Service, therefore I conclude, that it is not such
 an ancient Custom, as ought of necessity to be
 receiv'd; and that it is a dreadful Sin to depart
 from the Church, and forsake her Communion,
 for the want of such a Form of Prayer.

That which I shall next take Notice of, is,
 the *oblatory Prayer*.

° *Vide* his Apology. v. i. p. 39.

I readily acknowledge, that the Holy Communion is a Feast upon a Sacrifice, that the Eucharist is the spiritual Sacrifice of the Christian Church; and I am satisfied, that when St. *Justin Martyr* declares, ^p " That Prayers and Praises " made by worthy Men, are the only perfect " Sacrifices, and acceptable to God:" He does not mean that the Eucharist is not to be offer'd to God, as a Representation of Christ's Sacrifice; for he himself offer'd it up to God; as our Christian Oblation; but he only scrupulously declines to call it a Sacrifice, because it is not directly and expressly call'd so in the New Testament; and, I think, several Instances might be given, how strictly the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers did make use of scriptural Terms. But the Essentialists, instead of making the Communion Service more express and regular, in restoring the Prayer of Oblation, they have made it the more immethodical and confus'd, by inserting it before the Prayer of Invocation; for I take it to be extremely wrong and irregular, to make the Oblation before the Elements are compleatly consecrated.

However this be, the chief Question here to be determin'd, is, whether or no, it be necessary that the Oblation of the consecrated Bread and Wine, be by us made by an oblatory Prayer? or whether or no, it be not sufficient, that it be made only by a solemn Act of Oblation.

And I affirm, that we are not oblig'd to do any more, than to offer up the consecrated Ele-

^p Vide Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 269.

ments by a solemn Act of Oblation; and that therefore our Communion Office is not defective in this Particular; and I the rather think so, because, as Mr. *Johnson* observes and declares:

“⁹ As all momentous Actions are to be performed with a due Decorum, and with just Solemnity; so it is especially necessary, that this most weighty Negotiation, betwixt God and Man, be executed with agreeable Rites, and with Circumstances besitting such holy Institutions. But if we enquire into those Rites which were peculiar to Sacrifices, we shall find them to be no other, but the very Actions of offering. I will not pretend to say, that there never were any Ceremonies esteem'd necessary, by some particular People, for some particular Sacrifices; but what I affirm, is, that no Right is essential to sacrifice in general, but only the very Act, or Acts of Oblation: For, if it were otherwise, the Levitical Sacrifices were in reality null — The Priest used no Words, but the Actions were significant, and spake the Thoughts of him that perform'd the Office. Nor can I, upon the best Enquiry I am able to make, find any Ceremony generally thought necessary for offering a Sacrifice, but only the Actions whereby the Sacrifice was presented.”

Now, if this Observation be just (as I presume it is) then when we celebrate the holy Communion, and the Elements are orderly laid

upon the Altar, the officiating Priest does perform all the essential Rites and proper Acts of Oblation; for, in our blessed Saviour's own Words of Institution, he declares the Bread *Christ's Body given, i. e. sacrificed for us; and the Cup, the Blood of the New Testament, shed [as a Libation] for us, and for many, for the Remission of Sins*: And whilst he repeats the Words of Institution, he takes the Paten in his Hand, breaks the Bread, and then devoutly lays it on the Altar; and likewise he takes the Cup into his Hands, and then again decently places it on the Communion-Table; and by these solemn and proper Acts of Oblation, he does really, and in due manner, offer the mystical Body and Blood of Christ to the everlasting God. The whole Office then being a sacrificial Act, all this does shew that the holy Eucharist is offer'd by us, as our Christian Sacrifice, and by proper Rites, and is such an Oblation, as does shew forth the meritorious Death of *Christ Jesus* our Saviour, according to his own divine Institution. And forasmuch as the entire Communion Service, is an eucharistical Sacrifice, or Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving; and since, in our Oblatory Prayer, instead of, *We offer this Bread and this Cup*, we say, *Accept this our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*: Therefore I am of Opinion, that our Reformers have fix'd our Prayer of Oblation in its proper Place; for those Words respect the whole foregoing eucharistical Service, which we, in that suitable Prayer, properly, in the Post-Communion,

nion, beseech our good God, graciously to accept of.

Dr. *Brett* discoursing at large upon this Subject^r, says nothing of the absolute necessity of an oblatory Prayer; and, consequently, nothing to the Purpose; and therefore I shall have less occasion to say much upon this Head.

The Vindicator^r is of an Opinion, that the learned Mr. *Johnson* has invincibly prov'd, that the Bread and Cup were offer'd by our Saviour.

Reply. I am not disposed to argue against "The most illustrious Attestation (as Mr. *Johnson* calls it^r) which St. *Cyprian* gives to this Doctrine of *Christ's* offering himself in the "Eucharist:" For it does not affect the Point I plead for; wherefore I shall only add, if these learned Gentlemen, can clearly and evidently prove, that our blessed Saviour, when he instituted the holy Eucharist, did offer up to God the Father, the eucharistical Bread and Cup, not by an Act of Oblation only, but particularly by an oblatory Prayer, then they will have done something very much to the Purpose, and to their Credit; and that will silence all their Adversaries upon this Head, and surprise all Mankind.

The Vindicator farther declares^w, that the ancient Fathers, those learned Doctors, those old Martyrs and Confessors, "Did offer the Sacrifice by Prayer before they eat it."

^r Dr. B. D. p. 103, --- 122. ^r Vind. R. D. Pt. 2. p. 157.
^r Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 65. ^u St. Cypr. Ep. 63. ^w Vind.
R. D. Pt. 2. p. 163.

And the learned Author of the *Necess.*^{*} says,
 " The Agreement of the whole World, before
 " our Saviour's Time, and the universal Con-
 " tinuance of the Custom among the primitive
 " Christians, is certainly a probable Reason that
 " it is of moral Obligation, and was practis'd
 " by our Lord himself; and sure a little Modesty
 " is sufficient to oblige us to submit our private
 " and unsupported Conjectures, to the consen-
 " tiant Practice of all Ages. And if the Prac-
 " tice of the Patriarchs, of the Jews, and Hea-
 " thens; if the Custom of the whole World
 " be sufficient to give a just Idea of the Na-
 " ture of the Sacrifice, then we may infer the
 " Necessity of offering it by Prayer; for this
 " has been abundantly prov'd by the learned
 " Mr. Johnson²."

A. 'Tis very hard to have all the World to contend with! However!

As to the Heathens, I say, that it does by no means follow that this is a necessary Christian Duty, because it is practis'd by the *Gentiles*. As to,

The *Jews*, I say, that it does not appear that this was requir'd of them by any express Command of God, so says the learned Mr. Johnson²; and this takes away the Force of all Arguments drawn from the Practice of the *Jews*; for since it was no necessary Duty in the Time of the Law, so neither is it now under the Gospel Dispensation.

^{*} Page 145, 146, 147. ^y Page 147. ² Page 45, 46. ³ Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 2. p. 82.

The Texts of sacred Scripture, produc'd to support so great boasting, are nothing in the World to the purpose^b.

The Patriarchs built Altars when they call'd upon the Name of the LORD; and so when they made their Supplications to the great *Jehovah*, they offer'd Sacrifices to him, that their Prayers might be the more effectual by those Means, *Gen.* 12. 8. and 13. 4. and 21. 33. and 26. 25. Indeed, *Exod.* 32. 30. and *Numb.* 16. 47. have need to be compar'd with *Wisd.* 18. 2. where mention is made of *Aaron's* bringing the Shield of his proper Ministry, even Prayer and the Propitiation of Incense; but these Words imply no more, but that he used Prayer as well as Sacrifice, when he made an Atonement for the People. And no more can be infer'd from *1 Sam.* 7. 9. and *1 Chron.* 21. 26. And whereas it is written, *2 Chron.* 29. 27, 28. *And Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt Offering upon the Altar: And when the Burnt Offering began, the Song of the LORD began also with the Trumpets, and with the Instruments ordain'd by David King of Israel. And all the Congregation worshipped, and the Singers sang, and the Trumpets sounded: And all this continued until the Burnt-Offering was finish'd.* But this Passage does prove no more, but that with their material Oblations, they did offer to the Holy One of *Israel*, the verbal Sacrifices of Praise and Thanksgiving.

^b The Necess. p. 146.

And since these Arguments are taken from the learned and judicious Mr. *Johnson*, I shall subjoin this remarkable Declaration of his, ^c viz.

“ It must be confess’d, that it does not, from any of these Writers, appear, that the officiating Priest did offer the Sacrifice by Prayer.”

The Testimonies of the ancient Fathers, alledg’d to prove this an universal Practice, are next to be consider’d.

Says St. *Justin Martyr*, ^d “ When the Priest has finish’d the Prayers and the Eucharist, the People say *Amen*.”

A. But he does not say, nor do his Words imply, that the consecrated Bread and Wine were offer’d up by an oblatory Prayer, or that it was a universal Practice to do so.

Says St. *Cyprian*, ^e “ We pray at our Sacrifices with the Assembly.”

A. But not offer them up by Prayer.

It is there added, that *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian*, mentioning the Custom of rehearsing the Names of the Deceas’d in the eucharistical Oblation, do, beyond Contradiction, testify the Practice of offering the Christian Sacrifice by Prayer.

A. They say no such thing: And to pray for the Dead, in virtue of the eucharistical Sacrifice, and to enumerate the Particulars of the Institution, is not to offer up the Sacrifice by Prayer.

It is there also farther urged, that the harmonious Consent of all the Liturgies of the An-

^c Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 2. p. 83. ^d The Necess. p. 147. ^e *Ibid.* p. 148.

cients, are a sufficient Evidence that the Primitive Church offer'd up the eucharistical Service by an oblatory Prayer.

A. This was the modern Custom; but these spurious Liturgies are of too late a Date to prove this an Apostolical Practice.

According then, to the two Rules before mention'd, since the holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to Salvation, and yet this Practice has no Foundation in the Holy Bible, being neither read therein, nor can be prov'd thereby; nor have the Essentialists produc'd the consentient Testimony of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, to prove it an Apostolical Custom: Therefore, I think, that there lies no Necessity upon us to restore the Prayer of Oblation.

When we celebrate the holy Eucharist, there is, in fact, an Oblation made of the sacred Elements, and the consecrated Bread and Wine are actually offer'd up to God as our Christian Sacrifice, commemorative and representative of that one only truly propitiatory Sacrifice of *Christ Jesus* upon the Cross. Wherefore, I conclude, that it will be very strange, if they be guiltless, who make a new Separation, for want also of an express oblatory Prayer.

That grand Point in dispute, which I shall here treat of, is, the Prayer of Invocation.

'Tis observable, that the Essentialists have not restor'd the better qualify'd Prayer, that was in the first reform'd Liturgy, but have reviv'd an-

ⁱ Vide The 6th of our 39 Articles, and the Rule given to the Clergy 1571, in Dr. B. F. p. I, 2.

other, liable to many more, and even insuperable Objections.

The Author of *The Reasons*, &c^s. is inclin'd to believe, that the Force of this Invocation may be contain'd by Implication in our present Office. Why then is there so much violent Contention about it?

There can be no Necessity for restoring this Prayer, by the first Rule before lay'd down.

I cannot believe that our Saviour used such a Prayer of Invocation; because the sacred Oracles only say, that he used a Form of Blessing, and giving of Thanks, and then pronounc'd the Elements his Body and Blood.

I cannot think this Prayer necessary, which is nowhere mention'd in the holy Scriptures, and has no manner of Foundation in the Word of God, as I shall prove hereafter.

Nor can it be supported by the second Rule before given.

I do not believe, but that some of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers would have expressly mention'd it, if it had been the establish'd Doctrine of the Church in those Ages, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper were made the Body and Blood of Christ, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them.

One may begin with the most early Fathers, and read forwards, in order, a long Way, before one meets with this Prayer.

This Article is not expressly taught, in any authentick Record, by any one Father, during

the three first Centuries ; wherefore we do not lie under any indispensable Obligation to receive this Prayer. But this is not all, for I do farther declare, that this Prayer of Invocation is not only misplac'd, but is in itself improper, and such as ought utterly to be rejected.

Dr. Brett, indeed, produces ^h several ancient Liturgies, as clear Testimonies for the Universality and Consent of the four controverted Points ; and he says, ⁱ “ I trust I have fairly
 “ and plainly prov'd the *Clementine* Liturgy
 “ perfectly free from all Interpolations ----- for
 “ I have shew'd, that it contains nothing but
 “ what is agreeable to the Scriptures ; and that
 “ every Part of it has the Testimony of Ante-
 “ *Nicene* Fathers to vouch for it ----- and that
 “ every Prayer in it is agreeable in Sense, tho' not
 “ in Words ---- to the Liturgies us'd in all Parts
 “ of the Christian World ; which plainly proves
 “ the Universality and Consent of all Nations,
 “ and of all Christians in this Form, or in one
 “ perfectly agreeable thereto.”

And he affirms, ^k that the four Things in dispute, were restor'd, “ Because they had been in
 “ all the Liturgies of the Church, from the
 “ Apostle's Days to the Reformation ; that no
 “ Time cou'd be assign'd, no Place cou'd be
 “ nam'd, where there was a Christian Church,
 “ that had omitted these things ; excepting that
 “ the Armenians mixed not the Cup, but then
 “ they were condemn'd for it by a General
 “ Council of the Catholick Church. Now, as

^h Dr. B. D. p. 3. ⁱ Page 219. ^k Dr. B. f. Pr. P. p. 5.

" he avers^l, such an universal Harmony, in
 " Matters never settled by any General Coun-
 " cil, or any other Means, by which Chris-
 " tians, from all Parts of the World, might
 " consult together about them, cou'd never
 " happen by Chance, or have any other Orig-
 " inal, than that these things were taught and
 " order'd to be practis'd by the Apostles and
 " their Successors. Now, as he asserts^m, there
 " cannot be better Authority to prove the Uni-
 " versality of any Practice in the Christian
 " Worship, than the Consent of all these Li-
 " turgies, as they are Testimonies of the unani-
 " mous Consent of the whole Christian World,
 " in those Points wherein they all agree."

Here is a great deal boldly advanc'd, and
 very positively affirm'd; yet I presume, that
 the Evidences which he has produc'd, are so far
 from being decisive, that his Authorities are such
 as cannot be depended upon. For,

As he is grossly mistaken in some Particulars
 of very great Moment, so he imposes upon his
 Reader; for, had he publish'd four or five Litur-
 gies, and ten or twenty Offices more, there
 wou'd have appear'd, at first sight, such a ma-
 nifest Disagreement amongst them, especially
 about the Point under Consideration, that an
 intelligent Reader wou'd not have rely'd very
 much upon them; and therefore for him to
 make publick just so many as might serve his
 own Purpose, is no Demonstration of a fair
 Practice.

^l Dr. B. D. p. 387. ^m Dr. B. T. p. 121.

And these very Liturgies, which he has printed, are so very much interpolated, and so miserably corrupted, and the Authors of most of them so utterly unknown, and the Times of their being written so very uncertain, that of themselves they are plainly of no Authority.

As to the *Clementine* Liturgy in particular, I say, that forasmuch as it does not appear that it was ever made use of in any Churchⁿ, it therefore cannot be any very evident Proof of the universal Practice of the Church of Christ.

Besides, the Title is spurious, the Author of it is unknown, and the Constitutions, of which it is a Part, is a wicked Piece, wretchedly interpolated, and as such condemn'd in the Council in *Trullo*, as before^o, and this Liturgy was not excepted.

The want of the Lord's Prayer in it is a great Defect, and it is interpolated.

But Dr. *Brett*^p, can by no means think, that the Passage in it concerning our Saviour's mixing the Cup with Wine and Water, is an Interpolation, foisted in after the Council of *Nice*; but at least as old as *Justin's* Time, being so agreeable to St. *Justin Martyr's* Water and Mixture.

If the *Clementine* Liturgy then be as ancient as the Time of *Justin Martyr*, I do therefore from thence conclude, that this Passage is interpolated, because where that Martyr does recite the Words of Institution, he makes no mention of any such a Mixture: And I do also, hence farther infer, that the Prayer for the Dead, the

ⁿ Dr. B. D. p. 30. ^o Page 28. ^p Dr. B. D. p. 100.

Oblatory Prayer, and the Prayer of Invocation, are all of them Interpolations; because no such Prayers were made use of in the Days of *Justin Martyr*.

For the Rule by which we are to judge what Passages are interpolated in this Liturgy, which is older than the Council of *Nice*, is to examine and compare them with the uncontested Writings of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, and to see whether the same Points are attested by those Fathers^q. Says Dr. *Brett*^r, “ I will observe in what Points all these Liturgies agree, “ in Sense, I mean, tho’ not in Words; and I “ will then shew what the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers “ have written in Confirmation of these Points. “ And this, I conceive, will be sufficient Evidence, that whatever Interpolations may have “ been made in these Liturgies in After-Ages, “ these Passages wherein they all agree with “ one another, and with the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, have not been interpolated. For what “ is it that makes us judge there are Interpolations in all these Liturgies, but that we find “ some things in them, wherein they differ from “ one another, and which cannot be confirm’d “ by the Testimony of the most ancient Fathers? Where therefore any Liturgy has a “ particular Rite, peculiar to itself, it is evident that Rite wants Universality and Consent; and where it wants the Testimony of “ the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, it also wants Anti-

^q Vind. R. D. p. 128. ^r Dr. B. D. p. 23.

“ quity,

“quity, consequently, it fails in all the Particulars requisite to an Apostolical Tradition.”

Now, altho’ Dr. *Brett* says the contrary^f, yet the Prayer of Invocation has not the Testimony of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers to vouch for it; and whosoever will consult what he has written upon this Head, in his Dissertation, from p. 122, to p. 184, will find that he has said a great deal to amuse his Reader, but has not so much as undertaken to prove that this Prayer was used by the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers.

This, indeed, surpriz’d me, and yet it pleas’d me.

But this is a very strange way of proceeding, in a Matter of such vast Importance. Now, if so learned a Divine cou’d not prove this an *Ante-Nicene* Practice, the Consequences will be many, and very great, and such as will mightily affect this Point. For if there be no plain Testimonies of any *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, to prove that this Prayer was used in their Days (and I am persuaded that there is none) then, according the Essentialists own Rule, it must be esteem’d and adjudg’d an Interpolation in the *Clementine* Liturgy; and that it was not in the most ancient Apostolical Form of celebrating the blessed Eucharist. And not being in the original *Clementine* Liturgy, then we conclude that it is an Interpolation, or an Innovation, in whatever other Liturgy it is found: This Liturgy being the Standard by which all others are to be try’d. And the *Roman* Liturgy wanting this

^f *Ibid.* p. 219.

Prayer^s, is therefore, in this Respect, a Missal more Perfect, more Apostolical, and Scriptural, than the Clementine Liturgy.

Dr. *Brett*, tho' he cannot produce any Liturgy, that was certainly us'd in the *African* Church, which has this Prayer in it; yet he attempts to prove it by the Testimony of *Optatus*, an *African*¹, who blames the *Donatists* for pulling down the Altars, "Where the Almighty God is 'invok'd, and where the holy Spirit, being requir'd, descends."

A. Optatus does not say, that they petition'd the Holy Ghost to descend upon the Elements, to make them the Body and Blood of Christ, which is what was to be prov'd; and he does not say the Altars upon which, but where the Holy Ghost descends; and therefore, as they did not call upon the living God, but only at the Altar, so neither do these Words imply, that the divine Spirit did descend upon the Altar, to consecrate the Bread and Wine, but rather upon the Communicants, at the Altar, to sanctify them.

But St. *Augustine* (says Dr. *Brett*²) tells us expressly, "That the Bread is sanctify'd, by the invisible Operation of the Holy Ghost."

A. But he does not say that the Bread was made the Body of *Christ*, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon it; nor do his Words any way imply, that the Prayer of Invocation was then used in the *African* Church; and for this very good Reason, because, according to St. *Augustine*³, the Words of Institution did con-

¹ *Ibid.* p. 168. ² *Ibid.* p. 181, 182. ³ *Ibid.* p. 183. ^x *Ibid.* p. 180.

clude the Form of Consecration in that Church. And moreover, St. *Augustine* might have pray'd that the Bread might be sanctify'd by the Holy Ghost, and yet not have believ'd that it was made *Christ's* Body, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon it. Thus, in the Office for Baptism, we pray to God to sanctify the Water, without any Thoughts of its being made the Blood of *Christ*, by the secret Operation of the Holy Spirit.

It has not then yet been prov'd, that this Prayer was (I say) ever us'd in the *African* Church, in any Age, or at any Place. And no Testimonies are produc'd for the Practice of it in the Western Church, in any of the three first Centuries; nor in the Church of *Rome* for above a thousand Years last past.

And suppose that this Prayer was used there in the fifth Century (which, I think, cannot be evidently made out) yet; if so, it was rejected by the Church of *Rome* in the 6th Century; and by the *Gallican* Church in the 8th; and soon after in all the other Western Churches. And this methinks, wou'd argue as great a Dissent, as if they had never receiv'd the same

Dr. *Brett* positively asserts, ² " That the
" most primitive Church, and the whole Catho-
" lick Church, in all Times and Places, for
" eight hundred Years together excepting *Italy*
" (if that may be excepted-----) did pray to
" God to send the Holy Ghost, to make this

¹ *Ibid.* p. 327. Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 2. p. 179. ² Dr. B. D. p. 164.

“Bread the Body, and this Cup the Blood of
“*Christ*, without any Restriction.”

But I not only say, that this was never done in the Church of *Christ*, for three hundred Years after *Christ*; but also farther add, that there is no such Prayer, even in most of those Liturgies which are mention'd by Dr. *Brett*; so that the Majority of these Evidences, which he so much depends upon, must needs carry the Cause against him.

And 1. there is no such Prayer in St. *Peter's* Liturgy, as is confess'd: Nor, 2. in the *Roman*: Nor, 3. in St. *Ambrose's*: Nor, 4. in Pope *Gelasius's*, for he owns that these two last agree with the *Roman* Missal: Nor, 5. has Dr. *Brett* produced any one such Prayer, out of above four-score Offices in the *Gothic* Missal: Nor is there such a thing, 6. in the *Gallican* Missal: Nor, 7. in the Fragments of the *Mozarabick* Missal: Nor, 8. in King *Edward VI's* Liturgy: Nor, 9. in the *Scotch* Common-Prayer Book: Nor, 10. in our own Liturgy.

But the Doctor will say, that in all these Liturgies, except our own, there are Prayers to the same Effect.

A. Not so; in several of these Liturgies, the Petitions only are, that the Bread and Wine may be to us, the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*. In the *Mozarabick* Missal, they pray, that the holy and undivided Trinity, may sanctify these Hosts by the Spirit; that when it has been receiv'd by us, whatsoever dwells in us, contrary to the good of the Soul, may die;

and whatsoever dies may never revive again^s. In the *Scotch* Common-Prayer-Book, the Petition is, “ Hear us, O merciful Father, we most
 “ humbly beseech thee, and of thy almighty
 “ Goodness, vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify,
 “ with thy Word and holy Spirit, these thy Gifts
 “ and Creatures of Bread and Wine, that they
 “ may be unto us, the Body and Blood of thy
 “ most dearly beloved Son.”

But I shou’d rather chuse to say, that such Petitions as these do import, an earnest Request to God, to send his holy Spirit, not to make the Elements the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ*, but to be communicated to the worthy Receiver; that when the devout Communicant does receive the consecrated Bread and Wine, the Holy Ghost may operate in, or with, the same, make the holy Sacrament beneficial to the Soul, convey with it the Seed or Principle of eternal Life, sanctify the Soul, and nourish the true Believer up unto everlasting Life and Happiness.

And since the Western Liturgies have not any one Petition, where God the Father is call’d upon to send down his holy Spirit upon the Elements, to make them the Body and Blood of *Christ*; therefore the Essentialists shou’d not interpret them to that Sense they do, without better Testimonies, than they produce, from ancient, not *Greek*, but *Latin* Authors; for as they understand these Petitions, they are but modern Corruptions and late Innovations. But these Liturgies should not be made thus con-

temptible, without sufficient Reason: However, the Prayer of Invocation was never us'd in the Western Church.

Dr. *Brett* says^b, that the primo-Primitive Fathers, have not taught us with, what Words they invoked the Holy Ghost; and therefore I conceive that it will be a very hard Matter to prove this Point from those Fathers.

And, indeed, that learned Divine does not attempt it, but remits us to Mr. *Johnson*^c, who has exhausted this Subject. Mr. *Johnson* brings in St. *Irenæus* speaking home to the Purpose^d.

But that Passage is taken out of a Fragment, which is of no Authority; so that what he there alledges, requires no other Answer.

But he declares, that in the first Ages of the Church, Hereticks, as well as Catholicks, used it, because *Irenæus* says^e, *Marcus* the Heretick, "drew out, to a great Length, the Words of "Invocation."

A. What were the Sentiments and Practices of those Hereticks I do not know: But say, that when *Irenæus* gives us the Sense, and informs us what was the Practice of the Orthodox, in this Case, he assures us, that the Elements were sanctify'd, by giving of Thanks, and the Word of *Christ*.

The Vindicator alledges *Irenæus* and *Origen* as Evidences for this Practice, in those purer Ages.

^b Dr. B. D. p. 19. ^c *Ibid.* p. 128. ^d M. J. Unb. S. Vol. 2. Pref. p. 8, 9. ^e Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 194.

Irenæus's Invocatio Dei, is produc'd as a clear Proof that your Prayer was used in those Days. To this I say,

First, That Dr. *Brett* owns, that none of the most ancient Fathers have taught us with what Words they invok'd the Holy Ghost; and therefore the Essentialists will find it a difficult Matter, to prove that *Irenæus* does mean such a Prayer of Invocation as they have reviv'd.

Secondly, Although this is a difficult Passage, yet, to support their Interpretation of it, they have not produc'd any one Word out of St. *Irenæus*, or any Writer of the same Age, nor of the Apostolical Age before, nor of the Century next succeeding it, to induce any indifferent Person to understand that Father as they do.

Thirdly, This learned Person quoting *Irenæus* saying thus^f, " As Bread, the Produce of
" the Ground, is not common Bread, but the
" Eucharist, after God has been call'd upon for
" a Blessing : " Has not acted the fair Part; for 'tis not a just way of arguing, to give, in their Translation, their own Sense of such Passages as they produce for Evidences in their own Cause, instead of the Words of an Author. St. *Irenæus* does not say, as you relate the Matter, his *Percipiens Invocationem Dei*, may as truly be translated, Partaking of the Invocation of God; and what that means is the Question. This learned Gentleman is of Opinion with Dr. *Grabe*, that *Irenæus* did here use the very same

^f Vind. R. D. p. 131.

Word, which is used by St. *Basil*, for the Invocation of the Holy Ghost. But it does not necessarily follow, that St. *Irenaeus* did use it in the Sense you put upon it, because it was so us'd by St. *Basil* two hundred Years after. And this Observation of these great Men, will have less Weight in it, when we consider, that it is not certain, that St. *Basil* did use that Word in that Sense.

But the Author of *The Neces.* says^g, that we have St. *Basil's* own Practice and Direction, in his Missal for this Interpretation of this Word. But the Strength of this Argument is taken away by Dr. *Brett*, who says^h, which of the two Liturgies said to be St. *Basil's*, " Or whether either of them was compil'd by him, I shall not pretend to say."

Fourthly, Invocatio Dei, or calling upon God, does not necessarily imply a petitionary Prayer; for the *Psalmist* calls upon the Name of the Lord in Acts of Praise only, *Psal.* 105. v. 1. &c. and when he says, as *Psal.* 116. 17. *I will offer to thee the Sacrifice of Thanksgiving, and will call upon the Name of the LORD.* The Meaning, I suppose, is, that he will not only offer a material Sacrifice to the great *Jehovah*, but also adore the God of *Israel*, and magnify his holy Name in verbal Praisesⁱ. And it is as proper to interpret *Irenaeus* by the *Psalmist* as by St. *Basil*. And as Acts of Praise are term'd calling upon the Name of the Lord; so the Act of Thanksgiving, by which the Ele-

^g Page 136. ^h Dr. B. D. p. 305. ⁱ Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 281. and Pt. 2. p. 245.

ments were sanctify'd, is expressly call'd a Prayer by *Justin Martyr*^k, in *St. James's*, *St. Chrysostome's*, and *St. Basil's* Liturgy, and often an eucharistical Prayer, as *Dr. Brett*^l calls it.

And as *Irenæus's* calling upon God, must signify his calling upon him in Prayer; so I presume that it must signify not a petitionary, but thanksgiving Prayer. Certainly it is more honourable, to interpret his Words so as they may be consistent with our Saviour's Institution: And then we must here understand a Prayer of Thanksgiving; for the blessed *Jesus* did sanctify the Bread and Wine, by an Act of Thanksgiving, as I shall, by and by, undertake to prove.

And there can be no fairer way of interpreting an obscure Place, in any Author, than by another Passage in the same Writer, which is parallel to it, and relates to the same Matter, where he expresses himself more plainly and distinctly. Now, as *Irenæus's* *Invocatio Dei*, must needs signify such a calling upon God in Prayer, as he was then used to make, and, in his Judgment, wou'd make the Bread and Wine the Eucharist; therefore these Words must be interpreted by what goes just before^m, where he relates that the Bread is the Body of *Christ*, and the Cup his Blood, *in quo gratiæ actæ sunt*, over which Thanks have been given; and the determined Signification of the Word Eucharist, in the Passage under consideration, argues that the Bread was sanctify'd by an Act of Thanksgiving;

^k *Dr. B. C. L. p. 150.*
L. 4. c. 34

^l *Dr. B. D. p. 55, 59, 61.*

^m *Iren.*

which is farther evident from what immediately follows in that very Chapter, where he says, we offer to God, not as to an indigent Being, but *Gratias*, Praises, *agentes Dominationi ejus*, giving them to his divine Majesty; & *sanctificantes Creaturam*, and sanctifying the Creature.

The Vindicator saysⁿ, *Origen* has these Words, with reference to the holy Eucharist: "We eat the Bread, brought to the Altar, which becomes a holy Body, by virtue of the consecrating Prayer."

A. Origen says^o, we eat the Bread that has been offer'd by Thanksgiving and Prayer, now made a Body by Prayer; and that Prayer, no doubt, was a Thanksgiving Prayer, which, as *Justin Martyr* says, "Was a Prayer of more than ordinary Length^p."

Origen also declares, "That the Holy Ghost is the Fountain of all Sanctification^q."

A. That is in us; for *Origen* was so far from thinking that the Bread and Wine were made the Body and Blood of *Christ*, by the Descent of the holy Spirit, that he was of an Opinion, that the Operation of the Holy Ghost does not affect inanimate, or irrational Things^r. Now (according to the Rule by which we are to judge in such a Case, and which is allow'd of by the Essentialists) I think I may safely say, that their Prayer of Invocation is not coeval to

ⁿ Vind. R. D. Pt. 2. p. 132. ^o Con. Celf. L. 8. p. 399. ^p Dr. B. C. L. p. 150. ^q Vind. R. D. p. 132. ^r Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 180.

Christianity, nor an Apostolical Practice, but a corrupt Interpolation in the *Clementine* Liturgy.

St. *Basil the Great*, goes so far as to inform us, that none of the Saints before him have given us in writing the Form of Invocation^f.

To this Dr. *Brett* says^g, it may be he thought that the Author of the *Clementine* Liturgy was not worthy of the Title of Saint.

A. He might have related the Matter of Fact, without calling that Author a Saint, if the true Reason had not been, that it was not then in the *Clementine* Liturgy.

And St. *Basil* might have satisfy'd these Gentlemen, that this Prayer was deliver'd by Tradition only, which, as they intimate, "Can make that a necessary Duty, which the Scriptures have not made so^h." And yet they undertake to prove, that the Prayer of Invocation is commanded in Scriptureⁱ.

The Essentialists say^k, that *Christ Jesus*, in these Words, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing*, John 6. 63. plainly teaches that the holy Spirit should descend upon, and operate in the holy Elements.

A. Not to make them the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ*, but only to sanctify the worthy Receiver.

This Text is a clear Proof, that the outward Means, without the inward Grace, do not profit us; but does not plainly assert what you affirm; and we believe, that the Lord's Supper

^f Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 240. ^g Dr. B. T. p. 126. ^h Dr. B. f. Pr. p. 67. ⁱ Vind. R. D. Pt. 2. p. 114, 115. ^k Dr. B. D. p. 133.

is a Sacrament as well as a Sacrifice, as Sacrament signifies the outward visible Sign of an inward spiritual Grace, and a Means whereby we receive the same; and St. *Basil's* deriving the Prayer of Invocation from Tradition only, is an Evidence that clashes with your Exposition of this Text.

But these Gentlemen do mightily contend that this Petition is enjoyn'd, *Matt. 26. 26. &c.* and that this Text does demonstrate the Essentiality of this very Invocation.

The Defender argues thus, " Our blessed Saviour, blessed the Bread and the Cup—
" and does not Blessing, in Scripture Language,
" mean praying for a Blessing? and are not
" the Blessings of God the Father convey'd by
" the Holy Ghost?"

These are the Premises; the Conclusion which he draws from them is this, *viz.* " Therefore,
" to eucharistise or bless the Elements, is, in
" other Words, to pray for the Descent of the
" Holy Ghost upon them."

A. What is here in the Conclusion, can never be found in the Premises; this then is a manifest Paralogism. This is certainly an inconclusive way of arguing, otherwise one may prove any Proposition, by any Medium in the World whatever.

The Vindicator argues thus, " Since the
" holy *Jesus* blessed the Bread and Wine, and
" since blessing in Scripture means praying for
" a Blessing, since the Holy Ghost is the Con-

¹ Def. R. p. 102, 103. ² Vind R. D. p. 114, 115.

“ veyor of divine Blessings, and our Saviour’s
 “ humane Nature was actuated by this divine
 “ Spirit, how can blessing the eucharistick Ele-
 “ ments, which our Saviour calls his Body and
 “ Blood, be interpreted to any other Sense, than
 “ praying for a Descent of the Holy Ghost up-
 “ on them? and then our Saviour’s command-
 “ ing his Disciples to do what he did, makes
 “ a Prayer for this Blessing enjoyn’d.”

A. Now, to shew the utter Vanity and Weakness of this Argument, so very often, and so insultingly repeated by these Divines, I might say, that our Saviour did not bless the Bread, nor is there any such Scripture as this, *Jesus took Bread and blessed it*: And then the Foundation of these inconclusive Reasonings is undermin’d, and so all the Arguments drawn from thence fall to the Ground; and this I shall prove, as soon as I have made this one Remark upon this Passage.

You say *Christ’s* humane Nature was actuated by the divine Spirit; and therefore blessing the Elements must mean a praying for the Holy Ghost to descend upon them, to make them *Christ’s* Body and Blood. Now if I ask, how you came to know, that *Christ’s* humane Nature was so actuated? you’ll say, that the Scriptures declare, that *the Holy Ghost descended upon him*, and that *he was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with Power*^b.

And now if you ask me, why I do not believe, that the Elements are made the Body and

• Matt. 26. 26. b Matt. 3. 16. 12. 18. Acts 2. 38.

Blood of *Christ*, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them? My Answer is, the sacred Scriptures have no where taught us any such Doctrine, and it's Presumption to think to know it without divine Revelation.

The Essentialists insist upon it that our Saviour blessed the Bread and Wine.

A. There are no such Words as blessed it, *Matt.* 26. 26. in the Original, it is *Jesus took Bread and blessing brake it*: And the Particle *it*, having crept into the Text after *blessing*, has led very many great Men, into very great Mistakes.

Erasmus, in his Paraphrase, renders *Ελογήσας*, *Matt.* 26. 26. *When he had offer'd the Sacrifice of Praise to God*: And *Εχαρμήσας*, *v.* 27. *When he had given Thanks to the Father*.

Castellio renders those Words, *Having given Praises*.

In *Tindale's Bible*, *Ελογήσας* is translated, *Matt.* 26. 26. *and gave Thanks*. And *Mark* 14. 22. *Blessed*, *Εχαρμήσας*. *Matt.* 26. 27. *and thank'd*. In *Queen Elizabeth's Bible*, *Ελογήσας* is translated, *When he had given Thanks*. *Matt.* 26. 26. *And when he had blessed*. *Mark.* 14. 22. Accordingly, to make the Apostles Accounts of the Institution consistent, we must expunge the little Particle *it*, and render *Ελογήσας*, *Matt.* 26. 26. and *Mark* 14. 22. *Blessing*, for the original Word here, must of necessity be render'd in the same Sense as *Εχαρμήσας* is, *Mark* 14. 22.

You say^c, these Words are here used transitively, and certainly terminate on the Bread.

A. Not so; for by these Words are not meant, blessing and thanking the Bread and Cup, but ascribing Blessing and Thanksgiving to the great God of Heaven.

You say, in strictness, *Ἐχαρισήσας*, Matt. 26. 27. shou'd be render'd, *blessed*, or *eucharistiz'd* it.

A. No; for eucharistiz'd, in plain *English*, is thank'd; but our Saviour did not thank the Cup.

You say, it is allow'd, you think, by learned Men, that *εὐχαρισεῖν* has the same Signification in the History of Institution, as *εὐλογεῖν*.

A. If you translate *Ἐλογήσας* in *Matt.* and *Mark*, *blessed* it, you must render *Ἐχαρισήσας*, in *Luke* 22. 19. *thank'd* it; and the your infallible Rule of Tradition has betray'd you into an Error, and taught you to translate the Scripture into Nonsense.

Wherefore I say, since it must be granted me, that our Saviour did not thank the Cup, then, of necessity, by *Ἐχαρισήσας*, *Luke* 22. 19. must be meant our Saviour's giving Thanks to God; and therefore (that we may not interpret the holy Scriptures into Contradictions) according to the determin'd Sense of this Word in this Text, you must understand *Ἐλογήσας* in the other Texts, as signifying our Saviour's not blessing the Bread, but blessing God over it.

Mr. *Johnson* says^d, *St. Luke* acquaints us, c. 9. v. 16. that *Christ Jesus* blessed the Loaves;

^d Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 2. p. 245.

but St. *John* tells us, that he eucharistiz'd them,
John 6. 11, 23.

A. Eucharistiz'd them, that is thank'd them;
 this is wonderful! I think Dr. *W.*^e has a better
 way of reconciling these Texts, who informs us
 (1.) that in some ancient Manuscripts, the Words
 in St. *Luke* run thus, *He blessed over the Loaves*;
 which very well agrees with this Sense of the
 Word before given, that Blessing signifies blessing
 God. (2.) That this is an elliptical Form of
 Speech, to be supplied thus, *He blessed God over*
them; it being familiar both with the *Greeks*
 and *Hebrews*, to put, to bless a Thing, for bless-
 ing God over it.

Since then *Εχαρισήσας* can't be interpreted
 in any other Sense, than giving of Thanks to
 God; and *Ελογήσας* ought not to be interpreted
 in a Sense repugnant thereunto; therefore the
 two Texts, *Matt.* 26. 26. and *Mark* 14. 22.
 as is reasonable, shou'd be interpreted by the
 other five Texts, which have respect to the Eu-
 charist, namely, *Matt.* 26. 27. *Mark* 14. 23.
Luke 22. 19, and 20. and 1 *Ep. Cor.* 11. 24.
 Especially, since several Copies of the New Tes-
 tament have *Εχαρισήσας*, instead of *Ελογήσας*,
Matt. 26. 26^f. And there is this farther very
 good Reason for what I assert, *viz.* the ancient,
 usual, and proper Forms of Consecration, were
 really Forms of Thanksgiving.

The Essentialists contend^g, that giving of
 Thanks, 1 *Cor.* 14. 16. was a consecrating of
 the sacred Elements.

^e On *Matt.* 14. 19.
 123.

^f Mills Greek Test.

^g Vind. R. D. p.

A. Agreed. Here then, εὐλογεῖν is interpreted by εὐχαριστεῖν, and here also is a scriptural Instance of consecrating the Elements, not by praying for a Blessing upon them, but by giving of Thanks to God over them; and these are divine Decisions of these Points.

Says the Vindicator^h, εὐλογεῖν, is taken in a consecrating Sense, 1 Cor. 10, 16.

A. But not in the Sense you take it. As the Paschal Cup was call'd the Cup of Blessing, because it was sanctify'd by blessing God over it; so the eucharistical Cup is there call'd the Cup of Blessing, because it was sanctify'd by blessing God over it; and so the inspir'd Apostles blest'd it, not by blessing it, in your Sense of the Word, but by giving Thanks to God, and blessing his holy Name; to use the Words of the learned Mr. *Thorndike*: "Here, finding
" it evident, by comparing the Evangelists one
" with another, and with *St. Paul*, that blessing
" and giving of Thanks, in this Case, are both
" one and the same thing, signified by two
" Words; I must needs infer, that blessing the
" Elements, is nothing else but giving God
" Thanks over them — with intent to make
" them the Sacrament of *Christ's Body* and
" Blood."

In the Times when *Justin Martyr* flourish'd, as that early and holy Father does inform us^k, they sanctify'd the Bread and Cup, by Thanksgiving, by offering up Praise and Glory to God the Father, through the Name of his Son, and

^h Vind. R. D. p. 121. C. L. p. 149.

ⁱ Dr. B. D. p. 418, 419.

^k Dr. B.

the Holy Spirit. Here *Justin Martyr* interprets *Ελογήσας* by *Εχαρισήσας*, and here also is an Instance of the primitive Bishops sanctifying the Elements by an Act of Thanksgiving to God, as he expressly declares. *St. Irenæus* interprets Eulogy by Eucharist, and when he cites the Words of *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* x. 16. instead of saying, *the Cup of Blessing*, says, *the Cup of Thanksgiving*. In the Institution of the Eucharist, *St. Mat.* xxvi. 26. *St. Chrysostom* reads ^m *Εχαρισήσας* instead of *Ελογήσας*, and so interprets the latter by the former, which only signifies giving of Thanks to God.

And what surprises me, so do the Essentialists, in their recital of the Words of Institution in their new Office, which in fact is a Contradiction to their own Reasonings: It may be Truth prevail'd against Prejudice.

And whereas it is said, *the People wou'd not eat at the high Place till Samuel had blessed the Sacrifice*, 1 *Sam.* ix. 13. *Grotius* on *St. Mat.* xxvi. 26. says, i. e. *till he had blessed it, by blessing God over it*. " Thus, adds he, the " *Hebrews*, and after them the *Hellenists*, instead of saying, to bless God over a Thing, " for Brevity sake, say, to bless a Thing." *Dr. Wⁿ*. as before, speaks to the same purpose; and farther declares, " So, 1 *Cor.* x. 16. *The* " *Cup of Blessing, which we bless*, is the Cup " for which we give Thanks, according to the " Custom of the *Jews*, with whom the Bene-

^l L. 5. c. 2.
xxvi. 26.

^m No *suf. R.* Pt. 2. p. 90.

ⁿ On *St. Mat.*

“ diction of the Bread is conceiv’d in these
 “ Words, *Blessed art thou, O Lord our God,*
 “ *the King of the World, who producest Bread*
 “ *out of the Earth:* The Benediction of the
 “ Cup runs thus, *Blessed art thou, O Lord, the*
 “ *King of the World, who createst the Fruit*
 “ *of the Vine.*”

The learned Dr. *Grabe* informs us^o, that the primitive Christians, when they celebrated the blessed Sacrament, sanctified the Elements by an Act of Thanksgiving, “ according to the
 “ Example and Command of our Saviour him-
 “ self, who in his last Supper no doubt imitated
 “ the Blessings of the *Jews.*” To all which I add, the like Phrase is used, St. *Luke* ix. 16. and the Meaning of this does explain the other, and this must be interpreted by St. *John* vi. 11, 23. as before, which shews that our Saviour blessed the Creatures by blessing God over them: And indeed we can with Propriety and Sense speak of our Saviour’s blessing the sacramental Elements, whether we mean his blessing God over them, or imploring a divine Blessing upon them; but we cannot with Propriety and Sense speak of our Saviour’s consecrating the eucharistical Bread and Wine by giving of Thanks, whether we mean his giving of Thanks to God over them, or his praying to God to have them thank’d: Wherefore Eulogy must be interpreted by Eucharist, Blessing, by Thanksgiving.

^o V. Dr. B. D. p. 58.

Thus

Thus our Saviour sanctified the Elements by *giving of Thanks*, *St. Luke* xxii. 19. Thus the Apostles consecrated the sacramental Bread and Cup in a Form of Thanksgiving, *1 Cor.* xiv. 16. And the primitive Fathers in the Days of *Justin Martyr* sanctified the Bread and Wine by Thanksgiving to God, as I just now observ'd.

In the *Clementine* Liturgy, from the beginning of the eucharistical Service to the Prayer of Oblation, there is no such thing as praying to God to bless the Bread and Wine, nor any one Sentence or Word expressing or implying any such thing: Nor in *St. James's*, nor *St. Mark's*, nor *St. Chrysostom's*, nor *St. Basil's*, nor the *Æthiopick* Liturgy, nor in *Nestorius*, or *Severus* his Liturgy: In all these Liturgies the eucharistical or thanksgiving Prayer is continu'd to the oblatory Prayer^p.

And whereas it is said in *St. James's* Liturgy, in the recital of the Words of Institution, *giving Thanks, sanctifying, blessing, &c.* and in *St. Mark's*, *He gave Thanks, he blessed and sanctified, and brake it*; the Words *blessed and sanctified*, I do presume, were inserted only to denote, that *Christ Jesus* did, by *giving of Thanks*, bless and sanctify the Bread and the Fruit of the Vine. Now I affirm, that the primitive Fathers did offer up to God the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ*.

And, I do affirm, that therefore the Bread and Wine were entirely and compleatly consecrated before the Oblation of them was made.

Here then are a vast number of Evidences that the greatest part of the Christian World did always sanctify the Bread and Wine by giving Thanks unto God, and reciting the Words of Institution: Nor is there in the new Office the Word *blefs*, nor any Words which express or imply the Force of it before the Prayer of Consecration. And this Observation inclines me still more and more to think that the Prayer of Invocation is a late and corrupt Addition to the *Clementine* Liturgy, and a modern Error of the *Greek Church*.

But to attain to a more clear and distinct Notion of the blessed Eucharist, we must consider what it is that makes it so, and by whom it is so made.

I'll consider,

First, What the Lord *Jesus* did at the Institution of this sublime Mystery, in order to make the Bread and Wine his mystical Body and Blood. And then, *Secondly*, What Part his authoriz'd Ministers are to perform now, towards the consecration of the blessed Symbols of the Body and Blood of *Christ*. And here I would have it observ'd, that by our Saviour's consecrating the Bread and Wine is to be understood his making them his mystical Body and Blood; but by the officiating Priest's consecrating them is meant only, his performing those Conditions, Rites and Means, which are requisite and necessary in order that the Elements may be duly consecrated,

crated, by the Power and Concurrence of the blessed *Jesus*.

Now then, I'll consider,

First, What the Lord *Jesus* did at the Institution of, this divine Mystery in order to make the Bread and Wine his mystical Body and Blood. And,

1. He did set the Bread and Wine apart to be the outward Parts of the blessed Sacrament.

2. He sanctified the Bread and Wine, and made them the Symbols^a of his Body and Blood by giving of Thanks to God the Father over them. And so,

3. He consecrated those Symbols, and made them his mystical Body and Blood by Acts of Thanksgiving, and by his divine Word, saying of the Bread, *This is my Body*; and of the Cup, *This is my Blood of the New Testament*.

I am to observe,

Secondly, What Part his authoriz'd Ministers are to perform now, towards the Consecration of the blessed Symbols of the Body and Blood of *Christ*.

'Tis not to be thought that any mortal Man can by any Act or Prayer make the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of *Christ*: This must be the Work not of Man, but God; not of the officiating Priest, but the divine *Logos*.

The learned Dr. *Brett* says admirably well^r, these words of *Christ*, *This is my Body*, as spoken by him at the Time of institution, “ not

^a Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 144.

^r Dr. B. D. p. 176, 178.

“ only

“ only made the Bread which he then blessed
 “ to be his Body, but have also made all Bread
 “ which has been so blessed, according to his
 “ Institution, to be his Body ever since. *Ter-*
 “ *tullian* shews, that those Words of *Christ*
 “ make the Bread, when rightly and duly conse-
 “ crated, to be the Body of *Christ*. Those
 “ Words are the Word of God, and it is by the
 “ Word of God that whatever he has appointed
 “ or ordain'd, is sanctified and consecrated to
 “ us; but then it is by that Word spoken ori-
 “ ginally by himself, and not as recited by Man:
 “ Thus for instance, every thing that is proper
 “ for Food is sanctified for the Use of Man by
 “ the Word of God^s: But then it is by the Word
 “ of God as spoken by himself, and not as re-
 “ cited or pronounc'd by us, that this Sanctifi-
 “ cation is made. In the

1. place. The officiating Priest separates the Bread and Wine from common Usage.

2. He sanctifies them by Hymns and Forms of Praise, to be the Symbols of the Body and Blood of *Christ* our Lord and Saviour.

3. And because these Symbols were at first made the Body and Blood of *Christ* by Acts of Thanksgiving, and his own consecrating Word and Power: And are still, by virtue of that original Consecration, the divine Word and Power, the divine Designation and Appointment of the adorable *Jesus*, made the authentick Substitutes, the perfect Representatives of his Body and Blood whenever we celebrate the Eucharist ac-

^s Gen. i. 29. ix, 2, 3.

according to our Saviour's Institution: Therefore altho' the Priest does proceed farther, yet then he does not use his own, but only our Saviour's Words, reciting the Words of Institution: And by so doing, he shews by what Authority he acts, and by whom the Consecration is perfected: That by Commission from *Christ* he performs the Rites of the holy Eucharist, but that it is the divine Word and Power of *Christ* which first made and still makes the Elements his Body and Blood in a Mystery.

The Essentialists giving an Account of the Consecration of the eucharistical Bread and Wine, begin where they should end. The learned Author of the *Neces.* there says^t, the Repetition of the Words, *This is my Body*, "by a commissioned Person is an Authoritative Deputation of the Element to represent the Body of our Lord.

A. The principal thing which the Priest can do in this case, by the Authority committed to him, and in his own Words, is the sanctifying the Elements by a Form of Thanksgiving, that they may become the Signs of *Christ's* Body and Blood: Which this Gentleman might here have made a particular Head to have been insisted upon. The repeating of the Words of Institution seem rather to be a Declaration, that upon his doing his Part, the Elements become the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ* by virtue of our Saviour's original Consecration^u: It

^t Dr. B. D. p. 74. The *Neces.* p. 141.

^u Dr. B. D. p. 70.

being the preceding Acts of Separation and Thanksgiving which render the Elements the outward and visible Signs of the Body and Blood of *Christ*. This Gentleman says, “ The Oblation of the Bread does certainly derive upon it an higher degree of Sanctification.”

A. I take this to be a Mistake, because the Elements ought to be sanctified and consecrated before they be offered up to God.

He there adds, “ the Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the Creature thus offer’d, is without doubt the highest and last Act of Consecration.”

A. The highest Act of Consecration is not to be perform’d by mortal Man, but the adorable *Jesus*: Which is not enough consider’d by this Gentleman. And the last Act perform’d by the officiating Minister is the recital of the Words of Institution. The Scripture teaches no such Doctrine as is here taught, and such notions as these make me to have a very ill opinion of their infallible Rule of Tradition.

Here then I shall produce some Testimonies of the ancient Fathers, who do certify, that the primitive Christians, when they consecrated the Sacrament, laid the Elements upon the holy Altar, and sanctified the Bread and Wine by adoring the Great God of Heaven, recounting his Favours and Blessings, acknowledging his Power and Goodness, and praising him for the Creation of the World, his good Providence over Mankind, and especially for the Redemption of fallen Man by *Christ Jesus* our Saviour.

And

And then breaking the Bread, they repeated the Words of Institution, and that this finish'd the Consecration: But still testifying that it was the blessed *Jesus* alone who made the Bread and Wine his mystical Body and Blood.

And the Title Eucharist every where receiv'd shews that the Sacrament on the Minister's part was consecrated by an Act of Thanksgiving. Says Dr. *Brett**, " the Ancients look'd upon
" the whole thanksgiving Prayer as making the
" Form of Consecration, and therefore they
" called the Bread and Cup the Eucharist, which
" I can't persuade my self they would have done
" if they had not judg'd it to be consecrated
" with Thanksgiving. It would be very absurd
" to call the Food the Eucharist, (as *Justin*
" *Martyr* does) that is, the Thanksgiving, if
" Praise and Thanksgiving was not us'd at the
" Consecration of it." *Justin Martyr* shall be the first Evidence that I shall bring, but I shall take the same Liberty as Dr. *Brett* does, and make some little Alteration in Mr. *Reeves*'s Translation of him^y.

Says St. *Justin*, " After the Believer is baptiz'd, and so incorporated, or made one with us, we bring him to the Congregation of the Brethren, as we call them, and then with great Fervency pour out our Souls in common Prayers both for our selves, for the Person baptiz'd, and for all others all the World over. Prayers being over, we salute each other with a Kiss; after this, Bread and a Cup of Water,

* Dr. B. D. p. 236.

^y Vol. i. p. 114.

“ and mixed Wine, are brought to the President
 “ or Bishop, which he takes, and offers up
 “ Prayers to the Father of all things, through
 “ the Name of his Son and the Holy Spirit;
 “ and this Thanksgiving to God for vouchsafing
 “ us worthy of these his Creatures, is a Prayer
 “ of more than ordinary Length. When the
 “ Bishop has finish’d the Prayers and Thanksgiv-
 “ ing, all the People present conclude with an
 “ audible Voice, saying *Amen*. This Food we
 “ call Eucharist: For we do not take this as
 “ common Bread, and common Wine; but as
 “ *Jesus Christ* our Saviour was made Flesh by
 “ the *Logos* of God, and had real Flesh and
 “ Blood, for our Salvation, so are we taught
 “ that this Food, which, by the Prayer of the
 “ very same *Logos* who gave Thanks, [or con-
 “ secrated it by giving of Thanks] is turn’d in-
 “ to the Nourishment and Substance of our
 “ Flesh and Blood, and is in some sense the
 “ Flesh and Blood of the incarnate *Jesus*. For
 “ the Apostles, in their Commentaries called
 “ the Gospels, have left this Command upon
 “ record, that *Jesus took Bread, and when he*
 “ *had given Thanks, he said, do this in com-*
 “ *memoration of me, for this is my Body*. And
 “ in like manner, *He took the Cup, and when*
 “ *he had given Thanks, he said, this is my*
 “ *Blood*.

St. *Irenæus* says², “ How is it manifest to
 “ them that that Bread, over which Thanks has

² L.² 4. c. 34.

“ been given, is the Body of our Lord? And
 “ when therefore the mixed Cup and the broken Bread receives the Word of God, it is
 “ made the Eucharist of the Blood and Body of
 “ *Christ*.” And Mr. *Johnson*^b confesses that
 by the *Word of God* he thinks is to be understood the Words of Institution. Again^c, “ *Christ*
 “ took the Bread, which is of the Creature,
 “ and gave Thanks, saying, *this is my Body*;
 “ and likewise the Cup, which is of the same
 “ Creature, and profess’d it to be his Blood.

Tertullian says^d, “ *Christ* having taken the
 “ Bread, and distributed it to his Disciples, he
 “ made it his Body, by saying, *this is my*
 “ *Body*.

Clemens Alexandrinus declares^e, “ That our
 “ Saviour taking Bread, first spake and gave
 “ Thanks, then breaking that Bread, held it
 “ forth, that we might eat it in a rational manner.

St. *Ambrose* in his Treatise *de Sacram.*^f (or whoever was the Author thereof) put this Question “ By whose Words and whose Speeches
 “ is the Consecration made?” And then answers,
 “ Of the Lord *Jesus*: For all those things which
 “ were said before were spoken by the Priest,
 “ Praises were offer’d to God, and Prayer was
 “ made for the People, for Kings and others;
 “ but when the Priest comes to consecrate the
 “ venerable Sacrament, then he does not use

^a Iren. l. 5. c. 2.

^b Mr. J. Unb. S. Pt. 1. p. 235.

^c Iren. l. 4. c. 32.

^d Dr. B. D. p. 174.

^e Clem. Alex.

Strom. 1. p. 343. Bp. Pot. Edit.

^f L. 4. c. 4.

“ his own Words, but he uses the Words of
 “ *Christ*: Therefore the Word of *Christ* makes
 “ this Sacrament.

S. *Chrysoſtom* ſays^g, “ The Priest fulfilling his
 “ Office, ſtands pronouncing thoſe Words, but
 “ the Power and Grace is of God; that Word,
 “ *This is my Body*, &c. changes the Gifts laid
 “ in open view; and as the Word that ſays *in-*
 “ *crease and multiply* was but once pronounc’d,
 “ but is actually operative in our Nature ever
 “ ſince; ſo that Voice once pronounc’d has its
 “ Effects on the prepar’d Sacrifice, on every
 “ Table of the Churches, from that time to
 “ this, and till his own Advent.

Says St. *Auguſtine*^h, “ I have told you, that
 “ before *Chriſt*’s Words [of Inſtitution] what
 “ is offer’d is called Bread, but after the Pro-
 “ nunciation of *Chriſt*’s Words is no longer
 “ called Bread, but is named the Body.

“ Says Dr. *Brett*ⁱ, “ This is not ſaying that
 “ the Conſecration is perform’d by the recital
 “ of thoſe Words alone.

A. True. But it implies that thoſe Words
 conclude the Conſecration.

This is the laſt Act of Conſecration on the
 Miniſter’s part; and then the divine Words ori-
 ginally ſpoken by *Chriſt Jeſus* operate, and
 take effect, and ſo the Conſecration is perfected.
 After this the conſecrated Bread and Wine are
 to be offer’d up to God, in obedience to our
 Saviour’s Injunction; and then the ſacramental

^g Vid. Dr. B. D. p. 74.

^h No ſuf. R. Pt. 2. p. 102.

ⁱ Dr. B. D. p. 180.

Body and Blood of *Christ* are to be distributed to the devout Communicants after his example.

The Essentialists contend vehemently that the Elements should be blessed. They zealously argue for the Invocation as part of the Institution^k, as an essential Part of the Consecration; and cry out,^l does the Priest's saying, *Christ* took Bread, blessed it, and brake it, import his own breaking and blessing^m?

And yet these Gentlemen themselves never bless, no nor ever once desire God to bless the Bread and Wine before they offer them up to God.

Now the Elements either are, or are not, consecrated according to your new Office before you offer them up to God.

If they are not, then you do not offer up to God the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ*, but mere Bread and Wine: Then your Sacrifice is not the Sacrifice of the ancient Christian Church; is not that grand, pure, unbloody, foederal, reasonable, spiritual, holy, divine, mystical, and tremendous Sacrifice of the primitive Fathers: Then the Sacrament which you yourselves are to partake of is more perfect than that Sacrifice which you offer to your God.

If they be consecrated, then they were sanctified by Acts of Thanksgiving, and consecrated upon the recital of the Words of Institution: And this is what I contend for: And then your

^k Vind. R. D. Pt. 2. p. 141.

^l The Necess. p. 137.

^m Def. R. p. 110.

own Works condemn your selves, and all your Arguments about blessing them drop to the Ground, and so there is no occasion for your Prayer of Invocation: So that if you have not a mind that the Prayers should change places, you must quit your Oblation or Invocation.

But Dr. *Brett*ⁿ argues, that although our Saviour consecrated the Elements before he did offer them, yet we ought not to “ pretend to “ administer the Eucharist exactly in the same “ manner, and with the same Form of Words “ our Saviour did.

A. I am of an Opinion directly contrary to this, and think that his Example in this case ought to be followed before all other Precedents in the World: And since no Man can serve two Masters, if then your Tradition does teach us to deviate from the imitable Example of the eternal Son of God, it ought utterly to be rejected by all Christians.

You violently press it upon us, that since it was a Cup mixed with Wine and Water which the Lord *Jesus* did consecrate when he instituted the holy Eucharist, and since he has commanded us to do as he did, that therefore the Mixture is essential to the Eucharist. If then the same Arguments are as conclusive against you, as for you, then I think the Consequence will be this, if then our Saviour did consecrate the Bread and Wine before he did offer them,

ⁿ Dr. B. D. p. 134, 137.

and did command us to do as he did, therefore it is necessary that we should consecrate the Elements before we offer them up to the great God of Heaven.

Dr. *Brett* is also pleas'd to say^o, that our Saviour, his Apostles, and the most ancient Fathers, were exceeding cautious how they divulg'd the Mysteries of the blessed Eucharist.

A. But if they did divulge them, your Remark is to no purpose; if they did not, you have no certain means left of knowing them.

But our Saviour's Command to his Apostles was^p, *Go ye and disciple all Nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* And St. Paul says^q to the Elders gather'd together at *Miletus*, *I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shew'd you, and taught you publickly, and from House to House.* Again, *For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the Counsel of God.*

And the sacred Scriptures are not so obscure and defective in this Respect as you suggest; for we have in the New Testament a large Account of all the Mysteries of the Eucharist, and a distinct Account of all the necessary Parts of it.

St. *Justin Martyr* published a noble, large, and particular Account of this blessed Sacrament.

And altho' the primitive Christians did (as *Tertullian*^r declares) defend the most pious Mysteries from the Approaches of the Stranger and Prophane, yet it is plain from Scripture and

^o Dr. B. D. p. 3--22.

^p St. Mat. xxviii. 19, 20.

^q Acts xx. 20, 27.

^r Vid. Dr. B. D. p. 24.

the Apologies of the ancient Fathers, which were made publick, that all the essentially necessary Parts of the holy Eucharist were sufficiently made known to all the World, *Pagan* as well as Christian.

Dr. *Brett* says^s, and seems to take a pleasure in saying, that we have not a greater, nor more early, nor more numerous, nor more universal Evidence for the Canon of the New Testament, than the Essentialists have for the four controverted Points; and if the Evidence they produce be not allow'd sufficient, " then there can be no
" Evidence for the Canon of Scripture, or for
" any one Practice of the Christian Church,
" for the three first Centuries.

A. As to the Prayer of Invocation in particular, I say, that it has no Foundation in Scripture, nor is it an apostolical Practice, nor has any one Passage been yet produc'd wherein it has been expressly mention'd in the authentick Writings of any one of the *ante-Nicene* Fathers; nor is there any thing in the Prayer, and Order wherein it is plac'd, to recommend it: The most ancient Piece wherein it is found has been condemn'd by a Council, and it is a late and corrupt Interpolation in that Piece: It is a modern Innovation of the declining *Greek* Church; and was never yet universally receiv'd. If then we had no more to say for the Canon of the New Testament, than you have to say for this Point, than we should be no Traditors, tho' we

^s Dr. B. D. p. 374, 375, 378, 397. and f. Pr. p. 118.

should

should deliver up the sacred Oracles to the Free-Thinkers.

And now if this Prayer has no good Foundation in the New Testament, and really is an Interpolation in the *Clementine* Liturgy, then the Consequences will be many, and such as will mightily affect this Controversy. For,

Then this Point ought to be given up.

Then it will not be prudent, nor safe, to rely upon Tradition as an infallible Rule.

Then our Reformers (which these Gentlemen have so often perstring'd) are justified.

Then our Prayers (which they have so much condemn'd) are vindicated.

Then those Divines are justified who have appeared in the Defence of our most excellent Liturgy.

Then we may declare, that the most ancient Fathers have not conceal'd from us any of the important Doctrines relating to the Lord's Supper.

Then we may aver, that the holy Scriptures have fully and clearly discover'd to us all the necessary Parts of this Sacrament.

And then we may cheerfully follow the imitable Example of the adorable *Jesus*, when we celebrate the Eucharist: Which is so call'd from the Act of Thanksgiving, by which the Bread and Wine are sanctified.

When therefore the Bread and Wine have been plac'd upon the Altar, and Praise and Glory have been ascrib'd to God over the same, and the Words of Institution have been repeated, they

M

are

are then consecrated by virtue of the divine Word, and thanksgiving Prayer of *Christ*, by which they were at first made his mystical Body and Blood: For as St. *Ambrose* says^c concerning the Bread, “ before it is consecrated it is mere Bread, but after the Words of *Christ* have been added, it is the Body of *Christ*; and of the Cup of Wine and Water, where the Words of *Christ* have co-operated, there it is made the Blood of *Christ*.

And then the Elements are endued with all that Power and Virtue which is necessary for the increasing of Faith and Holiness in us, and for the nourishing of us up unto everlasting Life and Happiness.

But that the Bread and Wine are made the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ* by the secret Operation and real Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them for that very purpose, this is what is not reveal'd, and therefore it is that which a new Revelation or future State only can discover to us.

The Elements being then consecrated, are to be offer'd up to God as our continual Oblation, and as our Plea for Pardon, Grace, and Salvation: And so the Eucharist is properly call'd our Christian Sacrifice.

And as the Lord's Supper is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, set to it, not by Man, but by the everliving God; so it is a Sacrament, the partaking whereof does lay us under the great-

^c *De Sacram.* l. 4. c. 5.

est Obligation to pay a constant and universal Obedience to all the Laws of the Gospel.

And as the Lord's Supper is an holy Communion, where, by partaking of a Feast upon a Sacrifice, we do enjoy the highest Act of Communion with God as well as with one another; so it is a Sacrament, as that does signify, a visible sign of spiritual Grace, and is a means whereby we receive the same; so that in the prepar'd and worthy receiving thereof, there is imparted to us such Measures of Grace, *i. e.* so much Assistance of God's Holy Spirit, as may enable us so to live here, that we may be happy eternally: And thus all the Ends of the Invocation Prayer are answer'd, and I think in an Account more agreeable to the Words of Institution.

I believe that the consecrated Bread and Wine are the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ*, but to determine how they are so, is, I think, to explain a Mystery.

In my Opinion we go as far as is safe and proper when we say, that the Bread and Wine were made the Body and Blood of *Christ* by our Saviour's thanksgiving Prayer and divine Word, at first, and are still so by virtue of our Saviour's divine Consecration, Designation and Substitution, after an authentick Consecration by a commission'd Presbyter. Wherefore I think,

That they who say that the consecrated Bread is the Body of *Christ* only in a metaphorical Sense, do really err.

That they who say that the glorified Body and Blood of *Christ* are united to the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, do greatly err.

That they who say that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are really chang'd into the very Body and Blood of *Christ*, do miserably err.

And that they who say that the sacramental Bread and Wine are made the mystical Body and Blood of *Christ* in the Eucharist, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon them to make them so, do strangely err.

It remains now that I should give you my Thoughts about

The Mixture.

Having said so much in Vindication of our Prayers, I shall say something of the Rubricks.

I should have lik'd your Alteration of the Rubrick, before the Prayer for the whole State of *Christ's* Church, better, if you had only order'd that the Wine should be mixed with Water upon *Good-Friday*, and upon the Sundays next after *Midsummer-Day*, and *Michaelmas*, on purpose thus to shew the Lord's Death, and so much Conformity to the Practice of the primitive Church. But I shall not approve of what the Essentialists have done till I'm better satisfied of the Essentiality and Necessity of the Mixture: And they wou'd not have displeas'd me much if they had pleaded for some new Rubricks to have been added in some few Places in our Liturgy.

But here I speak under Correction, and with entire Submission to the Wisdom and Authority of our Superiors.

I know what ill use these Gentlemen make of any Concessions made by usⁿ, but the Answer is ready and just, we would not complain tho' some ancient and very significant Customs were restor'd, so it were done by a competent Authority, and not at the dreadful Expence of a fatal Schism.

But we do not believe that Water is an essential and absolutely necessary Part and Ingredient of the sacramental Cup; and therefore we would willingly have the Liberty not to imitate, but to blame that indecent Rant of the very learned Author of the *Neces*^s.

These Divines had gain'd more Profelytes to their Opinion, had they only recommended the Mixture as agreeable to the ancient and continued Practice of the Church, rather than as what is absolutely necessary to Salvation, the neglect whereof does affect the Vitals of Religion, destroy the Essence of the Sacrament, and cut off the Communication with Heaven^y. For since the Scripture has said so little about this Point, we cannot easily think that it is so absolutely necessary to Salvation.

But these learned Persons slyly insinuate that their Opponents, by depreciating the Evidences and Testimonies of the ancient Fathers, do undermine the sacred and inviolable Authority of

ⁿ The *Neces*. p. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8.

^s P. 9.

^y P. 14.

the holy Scriptures, strike at the eternal Dictates of infinite Wisdom, invalidate all the Benefits of divine Revelation, and remove the Foundation of Christianity².

This is a dismal Charge; but this is our Comfort, it is not just: This indeed would have been a piece of Rhetorick of the florid and sublime Kind, but that it has no Truth for its Foundation.

And that they may be easy, and not run into such violent Heats, and extravagant Expressions, I assure them that we allow all the Evidences they produce, and moreover assert the Scriptures to be Records from the beginning: We receive the Testimonies of the Fathers with as much Deference as they do, and as entirely rely upon the same, so far as relates to the Time they flourish'd in; yet this does not hinder but that we may consider the Weight and Force of the Arguments they alledge to support their Opinions: This does not hinder but that we may make a just Use of our own Reason; for right Reason is, and always was, and always will be, useful in Matters of Religion.

We receive the Testimonies of the Fathers, as to Matters of Fact in their own Days, without Scruple, but our Reason will not allow us to affirm that they were never out in Matters of Opinion: And whoever reads the most ancient Fathers, must own, if he will speak the Truth, that their Arguments are not always concluding, no more than those of our modern Writers.

² The Necess. p. 151.

And if I may be allow'd to pass my Judgment upon the Reasonings of the ancient Fathers, much more upon the Arguments of the Essentialists, I shall make my Remarks upon what they say in the Case before us, and judge by the Rules before specified.

They positively averr, that Water is of the Substance, Matter, and Essence of the Sacrament.

Here then I declare that it is absolutely certain from Scripture that Wine was that which was contain'd in the Cup instituted by our Saviour; but that it is not certain from Scripture that Water was an essential Part of that Ingredient it did contain.

A very great Man is positive^a, that there is no Precept in Scripture enjoining the Wine; that it is the Cup, which was mixed, that is commanded: And then he asks, what Evidence can we have for the Necessity of one part of the Mixture, which will not prove the Necessity of the other?

A. This is astonishing: But I affirm, that that which was contain'd in this Cup, our God and Saviour calls the Fruit of the Vine^b. Now it is as certain as any thing in the World, that Wine is the Fruit of the Vine, but it is not certain that that Phrase does necessarily signify Wine abated with Water: So that the sacred Scriptures do plainly imply the Necessity of the Wine, but not of the other part of the Mixture.

^a *The Necess.* p. 11.

^b *St. Mat.* xxvi. 29. *St. Mark* xiv. 25.

Nor do the primitive Fathers with one Consent declare that Water is of the Essence of the blessed Eucharist; but rather seem to be of a quite different Opinion, whilst they unanimously profess that it is the Wine that does represent the Blood of *Christ Jesus* our Redeemer.

The Essentialists say, from the *Gemara* of the *Talmud*, that the *Jews* called unmixed Wine the Fruit of the Tree, but diluted Wine, the Fruit of the Vine^c. And therefore our Saviour using the *Jewish* Phraseology, by the Fruit of the Vine^d, did mean Wine mixed with Water.

A. What the *Gemara* calls the Fruit of the Vine, St. *Irenæus*^e calls the Fruit of the Wood of the Vine, so that that Distinction does not seem to have prevail'd in *Irenæus*'s Time.

Mr. *Wagstaffe* says^f, that *Irenæus* was neither a *Jew*, nor wrote to the *Jews*, nor was there any necessity that he should accommodate himself to their Idioms.

A. But he was a judicious and pious Christian, and might understand and know how to apply the Forms of Speech used by our Saviour.

But that Gentleman urges^g, that the Words of that Saint are not, the Fruit of the Wood of the Tree, but the Wood of the Tree, which does fructify.

A. But I think that makes no great difference in the Reasonings from that Passage.

^c Vind. R. D. Pt. 1. p. 42, &c.

^d St. Mat. xxvi. 29.

^e Lib. 5. cap. 2.

^f Resp. p. 25.

^g *Ibid.* p. 25.

Besides, *Clem. Alexandrinus*^h declares, that the Scripture calls the Wine the mystical Symbol of the holy Blood.

*Tertullian*ⁱ says, that it was Wine which our Saviour consecrated for the Commemoration of his Blood.

St. *Cyprian* is express, and several times confirms this Notion^k. When *Christ* said, *I am the true Vine*, the Blood of *Christ* (as he there declares) certainly is not Water but Wine: And *Noah* (says he) being herein a Type of what has since come to pass, drank not Water but Wine, and thereby exhibited to us a Figure of our Saviour's Passion.

Again, "And who, I pray you, is more properly and truly a Priest of the most high God than our Lord *Jesus Christ*? Who offer'd up a Sacrifice to his Father, the very same which *Melchisedec* had offer'd before him. *i. e.* Bread and Wine, which were his own Body and Blood." And^l *Christ Jesus* calls the Wine press'd out of many Clusters and Grapes, and forced together into one Body, his Blood.

And as Mr. *Drake* observes, and says^m, St. *Cyprian* declares, that if either, Water rather is to be omitted in the Sacrifices which we offer to the Lordⁿ. From whence it will follow, that in the Judgment of that Martyr, the Water is not of the Essence of the sacramental Cup; for then it ought no more to be omitted than the Wine, there being no Degrees of Essentiality.

^h Pædagog. l. 2. c. 2. p. 184.

ⁱ De Anima c. 17.

^k Ep. 63.

^l Ep. 69.

^m Conc. p. 53, 54.

ⁿ Ep. 61.

And the following Passage, taken out of *Eusebius*^o, is very much to the Purpose; “ Like
 “ as he who was the Priest of the Nations never
 “ discharg’d his Office with corporeal Sacrifices,
 “ but with Wine *only* and Bread, when he
 “ blessed *Abraham*: So, truly, our Lord and
 “ Saviour first, and afterwards the Priests, in all
 “ Nations, who have their Rise from him, ex-
 “ ercising the spiritual Function, according to
 “ the ecclesiastical Sanctions, represent with
 “ Wine and Bread the Mysteries of his Body
 “ and salutary Blood; which Mysteries verily
 “ *Melchisedec* by the divine Spirit beforehand
 “ knew, and used the Representations of future
 “ Things, as also *Moses* testifies in the sacred
 “ Scripture, where he says, and *Melchisedec*,
 “ King of *Salem*, brought forth Bread and
 “ Wine.

St. *Chrysostom*^p declares that when our Savi-
 our “ deliver’d the Mysteries, he deliver’d Wine,
 “ and when after his Resurrection he spread an
 “ ordinary Table without the Mysteries, he
 “ made use of Wine, he says of the Fruit of
 “ the Vine: But the Vine produces Wine, not
 “ Water^q.

To this it is objected, that St. *Chrysostom* or-
 der’d, that “ Water should be mixed with the
 “ sacramental Wine, to represent the Blood and
 “ Water which flowed from our Saviour’s Side.

A. Yet still he is express, that it is the Wine
 only that represents the Blood of *Christ*: And I

^o Dem. Evang. B. 5. c. 3. p. 223.

^p No sup. R. p. 75.

^q St. Chrysost. in St. Mat. xxvi. 29.

take nothing to be an essential part of the Cup but what is to represent the Blood of *Christ*: And according to the Words of Institution, nothing more is requir'd but that this Blood should be represented by the Cup. Our Saviour neither commands that the Water that flowed from his Side, nor that the People should be represented in the holy Eucharist: So that we do not lie under a Necessity or Obligation to have either the one or the other represented in the Lord's Supper. We deny then the Essentiality of the Water, because this cannot be made out either from the New Testament, or the Writings of the primitive Bishops.

But we must suppose that the Essentialists will conclude that this Point must be given up when they have clearly prov'd that it is absolutely necessary that the Wine should be mixed with Water in the sacramental Cup.

They take the Water to be a necessary part of the Cup: I think the Mixture was only an accidental Thing at first^r.

Now I take it for granted, that in the Eastern hot Countries People commonly drank diluted Wine; and it is not impossible that when our Saviour did institute the holy Communion, he did make use of a Cup mixed beforehand, not for the holy Eucharist, but for the Passover only; And it is manifest that the ancient Fathers used mixed Wine when they celebrated the blessed Eucharist; but then I suppose that it was only an accidental

^r Def. R. p. 29, 30. No Necess. p. 4. No suf. R. p. 117. Dr. B. T. p. 172, 173.

thing if our Saviour did make use of diluted Wine; for it does not appear that our Saviour did take Wine and Water, or any one for him, and then mix them in order to the following Institution, and then consecrate them; but only that he made use of such a Cup as was commonly prepar'd for the Feast of the Passover: Upon this Supposition our Saviour made use of such Wine as was commonly used in those hot Countries, and we accordingly use such Wine as is commonly made use of in these cold Climates.

But our Adversaries undertake to prove from Scripture the Necessity of the Mixture. Their Argument runs thus.

Our Saviour consecrated the Cup when he instituted the Sacrament: That which was contain'd in that Cup was, he himself declares, *the Fruit of the Vine*, and the Fruit of the Vine, according to the Language of the *Jews*, signifies Wine that has a little Water mixed with it: And the primitive Christians always making use of diluted Wine, this also farther argues that our Saviour did so too. And since the holy *Jesus* establish'd the Eucharist upon a Resemblance with the paschal Solemnity, therefore when our Lord *Jesus* says, *do this*, &c. he commands the Mixture; and so this does infer the absolute Necessity of this Practice^s.

But methinks this Deduction is not clear and evident enough to demonstrate such a Necessity.

^s Def. R. p. 28, 29. Dr. B. T. p. 192, 195.

The Water was no necessary Ingredient in the paschal Cup, and therefore although the Eucharist were instituted in Resemblance to the paschal Solemnity, yet it might not be a necessary part of the eucharistical Cup.

There is no Precept at all for a Cup in the paschal Feast, it was purely a *Jewish* Institution: So that the Mixture there would not be necessary: Nor did the blessed *Jesus*, no, nor any one for him, mix the Cup for the sake of the Eucharist: Nor did he, or any of the blessed Apostles, enjoin this Mixture. And since the Water is not essential, neither then can it be necessary, since the Words, *do this*, &c. cannot reasonably be suppos'd to command the Mixture; for it cannot easily be thought that our Saviour did command us thereby to do what neither he nor his Apostles did do.

But if this Necessity be not evident enough from Scripture, Dr. *Brett* positively avers^c,
 “ Whatever appears to be the Will of *Christ*,
 “ and to have been taught by himself, or his A-
 “ postles, we are oblig'd to *believe and practise*
 “ according thereto:” And therefore we are
 oblig'd to believe and practise whatever is con-
 tain'd in the New Testament. “ But for as much
 “ as the Scriptures of the New Testament do
 “ testify that the Christian Religion was at first
 “ deliver'd by Tradition, and that we are as
 “ much oblig'd to observe what we find to have
 “ been so deliver'd, as what we find to have

^c Dr. B. T. p. 80, 81.

“ been written by the Apostles; and these Scri-
 “ ptures do no where teach that all things taught
 “ by our Saviour and his Apostles *as necessary*
 “ *to Salvation* are there collected and recorded,
 “ it evidently follows, that where we have cer-
 “ tain and undoubted Testimony of any thing’s
 “ being deliver’d by the Apostles as necessary
 “ to be practis’d, we are as much oblig’d to pra-
 “ ctise accordingly as if we were requir’d to do
 “ so by any Text of Scripture: And whatever
 “ has Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, has
 “ such certain and undoubted Testimony.

A. You have no such Certainty for the Points
 in dispute, and so all this fine Reasoning falls
 to the Ground: And I have already prov’d that
 the three former Points want Antiquity.

It is my Opinion that praying for the Dead
 began between the Time wherein *Justin Mar-*
tyr flourish’d, and that wherein *Tertullian* wrote,
 and then it will follow that a Practice may be
 of above fifteen hundred Years standing, and yet
 not necessary.

And you cannot prove any Tradition to be
 apostolical which has not a good Foundation in
 Scripture: And therefore to make any such hu-
 mane and undoubtedly fallible Tradition the
 Basis not only of what is necessary to be pra-
 ctis’d, but believ’d, in order to Salvation, is to
 pave a way that leads directly from our *Sion*,
 and tends to unsettle the Foundation of our holy
 Religion.

What is matter of Faith must not rest upon
 such a Tradition, but must stand upon divine
 Testi-

Testimony, and must be ultimately resolved into divine written Revelation.

You say we are commanded to adhere to apostolical Traditions^u.

A. But you have not yet evidently prov'd that the Points you contend for are really apostolical Traditions; make that out, and you may command our Submission.

Indeed when the Gospel began to be preach'd, and before all the Books of the New Testament were written, it was the Felicity of the first Believers, that they had the infallible Directions of the inspir'd Apostles to lead them into all Truth. But now the New Testament is compleated, and the Apostles are received into Heaven, and are succeeded by uninspir'd Guides, it is our Happiness, that we have a divine written Revelation to direct us in all things that are necessary to Salvation, and are not left to the uncertain Conveyance of a fallible Tradition.

And I think that it has been already prov'd that the sacred Oracles are a complete Rule both of Faith and Manners: And then it will follow, that we do observe that apostolical Injunction, in obeying the divine Revelation, wherein are contain'd all those Traditions which we are indispensably oblig'd to adhere to.

The Essentialists delight to say^x, that we have nothing but Tradition to depend upon, to certify us which are the canonical Books of the Old and New Testament.

^u 2 Thess. ii. 15. and iii. 6.

^x Dr. B. T. Pt. I. p. 185.

“ That

“ That where the y Tradition for Christian
 “ Worship is equally early and general with
 “ that which vouches some part of the Canon
 “ of the New Testament, there the Ground and
 “ Original of such Worship must be allow'd the
 “ same Credit ; for where the Attestation is e-
 “ qual, the Authority must be so too.

A. But you have not so good Evidence for the Points in dispute, as we have for the Canon of the New Testament : And one would think that the Tradition that does assure us which are the inspired Books of the Old and New Testament, had a good Foundation in Scripture : When the Scriptures themselves are that which is transmitted down to us by that Tradition, and have in them very many internal, and those convincing Evidences of their own divine Original, and Worth, and Authority. And the Books of the New Testament are not divine Records because they are in the Canon, but they were receiv'd into the Canon because they were written by divine Inspiration, and transmitted down as such from the Days of the Apostles to the very Time when they were receiv'd into the Canon. But you cannot prove that your four Points have any real Foundation in Scripture, and were certainly conveyed down through the three first Centuries as Traditions truly apostolical.

And the Canon of Scripture was drawn up by competent Authority in the first Ages of the Christian Church, that apocryphal Books might

not be imposed upon Posterity instead of Books written by divine Inspiration: But no such genuine Catalogues of apostolical Traditions have been so made, and so carefully transmitted down to our Days, free from any horrid Corruptions.

And as several Martyrs have given in their Evidence for the divine Authority and Perfection of the sacred and infallible Scriptures, by sacrificing their Lives rather than their Bibles: So I believe that the good Providence of God has been concern'd to preserve the sacred and canonical Scriptures from any fatal or dangerous Corruptions or Interpolations, by any Alteration made in them, or any Addition to, or Defalcation of, the sacred Oracles: But so much cannot be said for the Points in Controversy.

Moreover, it does no more of Necessity follow that we ought to receive those Parts of divine Worship which you contend for, because you have as early an Evidence for the Practice of them, as we have for the Canon²: No more than we are necessarily oblig'd to believe the Books of the New Testament to be divinely inspired, because we find them in the Canon of Scripture.

We do not believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God upon the Evidence of Tradition only, but upon farther Considerations and Reasons.

The Testimony of the Church does no more than put us as it were in the Place, Case, and

² Dr. B. f. P. p. 118.

Circumstances, of those who heard our Saviour and his Apostles publish the glad Tydings of Salvation, and saw them confirm their Doctrines by divine Miracles. But this did not make all such Believers, but their being convinc'd upon a strict Examination that those Doctrines were heavenly and divine, and that the Credentials of *Christ* and his Apostles were such as did demonstrate that they had a divine Commission to publish the same.

Thus humane Testimony is a primary Motive inclining us to believe that the holy Bible does contain the reveal'd Will of God, and we believe the Testimony of the Church which does certify that such sacred Truths were revealed, and such astonishing Miracles were wrought to convince Mankind of the divine Original and Authority of those important Truths. But then we do not rest upon that moral Assurance, nor with an historical Faith only; but diligently consider the subject Matter of the holy Scriptures, and religiously weigh in the Scales of the Sanctuary the internal Characters, and evident external miraculous Confirmations of their divine Verity; and then our moral Certainty does presently advance into a divine and infallible Faith, which is ultimately resolved into the Veracity of God, and his divine and undoubted Testimony: So our Faith is built upon the Assurance that the Scriptures are the Revelation of God, which is vastly more sure than the universal Tradition of all Mankind.

Nor ought the Essentialists to conclude that the Points they plead for are therefore essential Parts of the Worship of God, and absolutely necessary to Salvation, only because they can produce the express Evidence of the ancient Fathers, that they were used by the primitive Christians in their divine Service, before some Books of the New Testament were receiv'd into the Canon of Scripture; unless they can give farther, and those substantial Reasons to convince Mankind that the Points in dispute were Duties requir'd either by the holy *Jesus* or his blessed Apostles.

I proceed therefore to consider upon what humane Authorities they affirm that it is necessary that the eucharistical Wine should be mixed with Water.

And many Testimonies they produce for the ancient Use of the Mixture, but all of them do not assert the Necessity of it.

The first Testimony they produce is taken out of *Justin Martyr's* fam'd and most admirable Apology^a: And the Authority of that ancient and holy Martyr is Evidence enough that in his time diluted Wine was made use of at the Celebration of the blessed Sacrament; but he does not so much as mention the Essentiality or Necessity of the Mixture.

St. Irenæus^b speaks of our Saviour's Temperament of the Cup, but he does not in the least say that the Mixture is of the Essence of the Sacrament, or absolutely necessary.

^a Reas. p. 1, 2.

^b L. 4. and L. 5.

Dr. *Brett* observes^c, that in the *Clementine* Liturgy the Mixture is particularly expressed in the recital of the Words of Institution, thus, *Likewise also mixing the Cup with Wine and Water, and blessing it, he gave it to them, &c.*

But here this Liturgy is defective; for neither is our Saviour's Blessing recited, as the *Essentialists* would have it: Indeed there is the Word *blessed* in Dr. *Brett's* Translation, but in the Original it is *sanctifying*. Nor is our Lord's giving of Thanks here mentioned as St. *Cyprian* interprets the Words of Institution^d.

And it is redundant; for mixing the Cup with Wine and Water is neither in the inspired Writings, nor in St. *Justin Martyr*. Indeed St. *Cyprian*^e is of an Opinion that our Saviour mixed the Cup; but then I think it was his Zeal against the scandalous Practice of the *Aquarians* that made him to carry this Point too far.

I presume therefore that the aforesaid Passage in the *Clementine* Liturgy is a spurious and corrupt Addition.

Dr. *Brett* is displeas'd^f because we think that *Justin Martyr's Cup of Water and Mixture* is a difficult Passage; and yet I think that he is not satisfied with his own Explanation of it^g.

I fancy that the Water was to wash the Bishop's Hands. And St. *Cyril of Jerusalem*, in his *Mytagogical Catechism*^h, informs us that at the Eucharist the Deacon held Water to the Bishop, and the Presbyters, to wash their Hands, and

^c Dr. B. D. p. 86.
p 98, 99.

§ P. 100.

^d Ep. 63.

^e *Ibid.*

^f Dr. B. D.

^h Dr. B. C. L. p. 152.

that their washing of their Hands was to signify, that we ought to be cleansed from all our Sins and Iniquities: So the blessed *David* going to handle the holy Mysteries, saysⁱ, *I will wash my Hands in Innocency, O Lord, and so will I compass thine Alar.*

But Dr. *Brett* says^k, that the Water was to be added to the mixed Wine in the sight of the People, “ that they might be assur’d they had “ not pure, but mixed Wine.” And he produces this Passage out of *Justin Martyr* to shew how exactly this agrees with the *Clementine* Liturgy^l: And so argues, that the Tradition of *Christ’s* mixing the Cup with Wine and Water, in the *Clementine* Liturgy, was a Tradition as old as *Justin’s* Days, and consequently apostolical; Since at that time they added Water to the *Keçma*, and the Martyr tells us, “ that this is “ agreeable to what the Apostles had taught, “ and what *Christ* had commanded. If you insist upon this, your Cause will suffer by it; for then all your Arguments from the palchal, being a mixed, Cup fall to the Ground; for that was not enough, unless our Saviour mixed the Wine with Water, in the sight of his Apostles.

But if *Justin Martyr’s* pure Water was to wash the Priest’s Hands, then methinks the *Clementine* Liturgy is interpolated, and St. *Cyprian* was mistaken when he said that *Christ Jesus* did mix Water with the eucharistical Wine.

ⁱ Psal. xxii. 6.
p. 99, 100.

^k Dr. B. C. L. p. 149.

^l Dr. B. D.

Wherefore,

Wherefore, such a tottering Tradition shall be no infallible Rule with me.

But *Clem. Alexand.*^m says, that our Saviour enjoin'd the Mixture.

And *St. Cyprian* is positiveⁿ, that our Saviour's Commandment was, that the eucharistical Wine should be mixed with Water. But yet Persons so eminent for Learning and Wisdom, for Virtue and Piety, might be mistaken, and advance a common Custom into a necessary duty.

And as an excellent divine has observ'd^o, *St. Cyprian* plainly intimates that some of the Bishops, who by the Grace of God were then set over the several Churches of the World, did not hold this Tradition^p: And that as some of his Predecessors were so far from holding the Necessity of the Mixture, that they had omitted the Wine, the principal Ingredient of the Cup: So by these his Words, [*Qui nunc à Deo admoniti & instructi sumus*] *Now we are admonished and instructed of God*, he seems to have resort unto Visions, and to acknowledge that even he himself had not always held the Necessity of the Mixture; and he evidently shews that this Doctrine was not then generally receiv'd amongst the Bishops in Communion with him, when at the end of the Epistle, he says, and of this let us write to our fellow Bishops, that so the evangelical Law, and our Lord's Tradition, may be observ'd *every where*, without the least Departure from *Christ's* Example and Instruction.

^m Pædag. l. 2. c. 2.
p. 39, 40.

ⁿ Ep. 63.

^o No suf. R. Pt. 1.

^p *St. Cyp. Ep. 63. ad Prin.*

But it is urg'd that St. *Cyprian* "has the
" *Concurrence of Fathers that lived before*
" *him*."

And yet there is but one produc'd asserting
the Necessity of it before him.

It is added, that he had the " *Consent of the*
" *Church of his own Time.*" And yet both he
and his Collegues seem to be but admonish'd of
it about the Time of his Writing: So that it does
not certainly appear that it was then a general
and uncontested Doctrine.

Wherefore according to the two Rules I de-
sign'd to be guided by in this Enquiry, I pre-
sume that I may declare, that since the Essentia-
lity and Necessity of the Mixture has no suffici-
ent Foundation in the New Testament, nor was
transmitted down to St. *Cyprian* by an apostoli-
cal, uninterrupted and universal Tradition, there-
fore that it is not to be esteem'd absolutely ne-
cessary to Salvation. But it is farther affirm'd,
that over and above all this, St. *Cyprian's* Judg-
ment is ratified, by the *uninterrupted Practice*
of one thousand five hundred Years. And here
the Essentialists quote the Authorities of very
many ancient Liturgies.

To this I say, that the Authors of them are
not all known, and the Pieces of them are so
miserably interpolated, that those Liturgies of
themselves are of no Authority at all.

They also produce, besides the Testimonies
of many Fathers, the Decrees of several Coun-

cils, and, I had almost said, the Armies of the living God^r.

A. First, Had the Thing been commanded by our Church, I would have submitted.

Secondly, Altho' this is very solemn, and even commands due Reverence, yet I presume that one may truly and justly say, that if this Opinion had not obtain'd when St. *Cyprian* wrote, the three Marks of an indisputable Verity, namely, Antiquity, Universality and Consent, (as I am persuaded it had not) then it could not acquire them afterwards.

But still, although the Essentialists could prove the Necessity of the Mixture, yet they would not thereby be justified; for they might have mixed their eucharistical Wine with Water, and so prevented a Schism.

But Dr. *Brett*^s could not receive the Communion at the Hands of those who refus'd him that essential Part thereof, namely, a Cup mixed with Wine and Water.

Reply. Here was nothing requir'd that was sinful, and these Gentlemen might have been conniv'd at in making up all supposed Defects; I think therefore that they will never be able to prove from Scripture and the consentient Testimony of the primitive Fathers, that such a Scruple will justify such a Separation. But to come to a Conclusion.

^r Def. R. p. 120, 121.

^s D. B. f Pr. p. 130.

CONCLUSION.

IT is my Opinion that our eucharistical Service is more agreeable to the divine Institution, more consonant to the expresse Doctrines of the most ancient Fathers, more methodical, more direct, and more free from Confusion, than that of the Essentialists; and therefore, that they ought rather to have blessed God that our Reformation was so perfect as it is, every thing consider'd, than by a deplorable Schism, to have done the Church the greatest Mischief possible.

And if any Persons shall be dispos'd to take notice of this Performance, I desire that they would speak plainly and directly to the main Points in dispute.

That they would directly and positively affirm, or deny, that the Scriptures are a complete and perfect Rule to us in all Matters absolutely necessary.

That they would plainly and expressly tell us, that Tradition alone is a clear and infallible Rule, which does teach us some essential Parts of Christianity, not revealed in the New Testament; or ingenuously own that it is only an excellent means of understanding the divine Oracles.

That they wou'd give up the Cause, or else fully make it out that altho' we already have a Prayer for the Dead in a proper Office, yet it is

so absolutely necessary that such a Prayer should be made part of the eucharistical Service, that it is better to make a Schism than to be without it.

That they would either yield up the Point, or else plainly assert, and clearly make out, that although we are agreed that the Eucharist is a commemorative Sacrifice, and is made so by us, by an Act of Oblation in its proper place, yet that the want of a Prayer of Oblation is such a Defect, that it is worth the while to rend the Church into pieces in order to introduce the same.

That they would affirm and maintain that the Prayer of Invocation is really necessary in the Order that they have plac'd it; or fairly to acknowledge that their infallible Rule has deceiv'd them.

That they would assert and prove that an indispensable Necessity lay upon them, (tho' they knew that a fearful Schism would be the Consequence of it) to make a Separation upon the account of the Mixture, altho' they might without a Breach have their eucharistical Wine mix'd with Water; or else piously confess their Error, and religiously unite themselves to their former Brethren.

And I earnestly intreat them seriously to reflect, how that very learned and very pious Men have erred.

How that even noble Confessors have fallen into Schism.

How

How fatal any Division must be to the small Remnant of a Church.

How Schism is one of the greatest of Sins, and Schismatics some of the greatest of Sinners. And

How much it concerns them to take care that they may not be found at the last Day, such Persons against whom they have said very many, and it may be very justly, yet very terrible Things.

And now I know that you do not expect that I should make any Excuse for so long an Epistle; I have therefore only to add, that I am,

Dear SIR,

your very much

obliged Friend

and Servant,

S. W.

FINIS.

Apr. 23.
1720.

FOX

From 1901 to 1904 in the same way.

1910

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044

1944-1945

...and the ...

10-11-67

1947-1948

800-441-4444

and I was very much interested in the work of the

1946-1947

77-11

12

CHANDLER 1937 2840

1990

1891

1913

1980

BRITISH



MUSEUM

2 1 1 1 1 1

100 - 100 - 100



21417